THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It is more than ever necessary that the Christian point of view on all matters in which Betting or Gambling is concerned should be kept well to the fore. It may be that there is a disinclination in many quarters to come to grips with the realities of individual social evils for the reason that they derive from a non-Christian habit of mind, and may only be expected to abate their virulence when once again the Christian Faith becomes fully operative amongst the multitude. That may well be so, but at the same time the extent and prevalence of this particular evil, at any rate, ought to be fully recognized, and the Christian testimony concerning it should be emphatic. No student of our modern society, be he Christian or non-Christian, can be other than alarmed at the spread of Betting and Gambling facilities of all kinds, and if this tendency in a 'Welfare State' be not checked, the alarm may well become despondency.

Such thoughts may well introduce readers to an exceedingly valuable little book, *Gambling in English Life*.[1] The writer is the Rev. E. Benson Perkins, a Methodist ex-President, and Chairman of the Churches' Committee on Gambling. Mr. Benson Perkins is a recognized authority on this subject, and the book is to be commended not only for its careful collation of facts and consideration of arguments, but for its tone and temper. Here is no rabid kill-joy, but a skilled, scientific investigator concerned only to reach a Christian attitude, with no striving or crying aloud. The attack on this evil is the more deadly because of the studied moderation with which it is made. Perhaps Mr. Benson Perkins wisely enough concluded that the one thing needful was to state the facts and let them provide their own purple patches. In this realm, words, by comparison with facts, are so halt and maimed that not even the crutch of an entrancing style would help them to compete for mastery.

'Gambling' is the term conventionally used to cover gaming, betting, lotteries, and gambling speculation, the four main forms under which gambling practices take place. Mr. Benson Perkins seems to favour Canon Peter Green's definition of Gambling: 'Gambling is an agreement between two parties whereby the transfer of something of value, from one to the other, is made dependent upon an uncertain event, in such a way that the gain of one party is balanced by the loss of another.' Essential features to be found in all Gambling Mr. Benson Perkins sets out as follows:

1. The exchange of money takes place without any equivalent value, material or personal.
2. The possession of money is determined solely by luck.
3. The gain of the winners is made possible by the loss of the losers.
4. The risk is often unnecessary and artificial.

A historical résumé follows, and then a chapter on the Twentieth Century, which brings him to make the following statement. 'The total amount of betting on horses, dogs, and pools represents an annual turnover of £650 million, which is nearly 2s. in the £ or approximately 9 per cent. of the total consumers' expenditure.' These figures are for 1949. 'Gambling is indulged in by more than 50 per cent. of the community.'

Going on to try to account for the vast increase in Gambling in the twentieth century, Mr. Benson Perkins has no hesitation in supporting the finding of the Royal Commission of 1933. 'One of the main causes, perhaps the most potent in the growth of gambling, has been the increased facilities for organized gambling.' The Commission went on to use the term, 'mass-exploitation,' and Mr. Benson Perkins shows how this mass-exploitation is carried through. Not the least interesting is his chapter on Economic Considerations, where he reaches the conclusion that the gross cost is sheer waste; the redistributed money devaluated wealth; the net, or production, cost is mere profiteering.

'Some years ago a book was published giving many of the personal stories of the winners of the Calcutta Sweepstakes over a period of nearly one hundred years. For a great number of these winners the results were disastrous, and in the case of others, though disaster would not be the

[1] Epworth Press; 6s. net.

right word to use, it seemed very questionable whether anything of permanent value had come to them as a result of the prize.'

After dealing with social consequences and matters of law, Mr. BENSON PERKINS comes to his most rewarding chapter of all, 'A Christian Judgment.' It is well-known that the voice of the Church loses something of its force because there is not complete unanimity.[1] Giving evidence before the present Royal Commission (and after this book had gone to press) Roman Catholic authorities reasserted their familiar position. 'We hold that betting is not wrong in itself. I do it myself.' Thus spoke a Roman Catholic Canon. Football pools were 'quite beneficial.' The R.C. Memorandum submitted declared: 'Neither is it wrong to play for stakes, even for large stakes, provided the players can easily afford it and the game is not vitiated by circumstances that would make it wrong. There is nothing essentially wrong in a man earning his living as a gamester or a bookmaker.' Mr. BENSON PERKINS deals searchingly, by implication, if not always directly, with all this. He puts the plain question to all who accept Christian sanctions, not, Is it desirable?—Is it expedient?—Is it of value? The question he puts is, Is it right?

In a closely reasoned passage he deals with those who declare that there is nothing wrong in itself in Gambling by arguing that this is a statement basically unreal, and by quoting William Temple approvingly. 'An act cannot, strictly speaking, be wrong in itself apart from both motive and consequence. So isolated, it is a mere physical fact devoid of personality. The moral value, positive or negative, lies always in personality—that of the agent and that of any one affected by his act; but it must be tested by inquiry into three things: the character expressed in the act, the principle involved in the act, or the consequences resulting from the act.' On such a basis, remarks Mr. BENSON PERKINS, there can be no doubt about the wrong of all Gambling, but it is not a question of wrong *per se*, which, in any case, is an unreal inquiry, for the act of Gambling cannot be so isolated, but the invariable wrong involved in purpose and relationship.

Last of all, Mr. BENSON PERKINS relates the whole question to the specific Christian position, laying down the main elements in a Christian judgment. (*a*) Life is truly based upon the providential care of a loving God, not upon chance or luck. (*b*) Money, like other instruments of life, is to be governed by use, not waste. (*c*) The true relationship of life is love: the false relationship of life is covetousness. And, of course, as he ought, Mr. BENSON PERKINS quotes Studdert-Kennedy:

There, while they played with dice, He made His sacrifice—
And died upon the Cross to rid God's world of sin.

The Rev. N. H. G. ROBINSON, B.D., D.Litt., is of opinion that one principal source of confusion at the present day, militating against an integrated outlook upon life and destiny, is to be found in the relationship between Christian faith and the ordinary moral consciousness, the two being often at variance. It is in an effort to clear up some part at least of this confusion that he has published a book entitled *Faith and Duty*.[2]

His particular concern in these pages is with man's moral as distinguished from his rational nature, and he seeks to bring Christian insight on this matter into active relationship with other beliefs. In the course of his inquiry he finds that, on the one hand, the principal movement in contemporary theology is not yet adequately aware of the realities of the moral situation, and on the other, that the ethical approach while in large measure understanding this situation is none the less unable to comprehend man's total predicament.

Turning to the principal movement in contemporary theology, he finds there a certainly sufficient understanding of man's total predicament. The writers dealt with are Karl Barth, Emil Brunner, and Reinhold Niebuhr. But in none of these does Dr. ROBINSON find any treatment of the subject that fully reconciles what they believe about human sinfulness with what is normally believed about human responsibility. Man, it is normally believed, is a responsible moral agent; but how can he be held to be so if his nature as such is corrupt?

We shall not attempt to show even in brief how the contributions of Barth, Brunner, and Niebuhr respectively are here viewed. It is enough for our purpose to quote first Professor John Baillie's comment on the positions of the first two writers, which is here cited as fitting the moral question of our service of God (as well as the intellectual one of our knowledge of God, regarding which it was primarily made): 'Dr. Barth's position seems

[1] This note does not refer to 'Gambling: An Ethical Discussion'—the Report of the Social and Industrial Commission of the Church of England Assembly as it was in print before the issue of this report.—EDITOR.

[2] Gollancz; 12s. 6d. net.

untrue to the facts but clearly argued; Dr. Brunner's position seems nearer the truth but, because it is not sufficiently far advanced beyond the other, to be involved in confusion and unreal compromise.' And having quoted this, we cite Dr. Robinson's 'final estimate,' which catches up the comment aforesaid: 'The final estimate must be, then, that although Niebuhr may have contrived to depart farther from Barth than Brunner did, he has likewise failed to indicate a credible point of contact in man for the self-revelation of God, and that he has also so failed because his departure has not been sufficiently drastic.'

Passing from the neo-conservative theologians and turning to the ethical approach to the problem of the relation between universal sinfulness and individual responsibility, Dr. Robinson reaches the conclusion that as a whole ethics has neglected and even ignored the fact of moral imperfection, and that it has operated instead with the questionable idea of moral progress. However, Dr. Tennant's position, though plainly theological, offers no violence to the clear findings of the moral consciousness. Yet it appears to be wrong to surrender with him the idea of strict universality and substitute an empirical universality subject to all sorts of qualifications.

At this point an alternative notion demands consideration, that of the moral solidarity of the race and of collective responsibility for sin. Here, says our author, we appear to transcend the opposition between strict universality, implying necessity, and leading to the denial of responsibility, and that merely empirical universality which fails adequately to qualify the reality of sin. Professor H. D. Lewis rejects the validity of the idea of collective responsibility, but he in turn is charged with holding an 'atomic' view of action, as if the various 'pieces' of moral conduct which together form the moral situation of humanity were as separate one from another 'as the bits and pieces of a jig-saw puzzle.'

It is Dr. Robinson's main contention that the world is indeed an absolutely joint enterprise; and that there is no difference, for all have sinned, is true on the ultimate level. Yet, as he adds, a belief in the completeness of natural man's sin is compatible with a belief in his less than total moral corruption or imperfection, and compatible therefore with a belief in his responsibility, in the sense now not of his freedom to sin but of his freedom to respond to God's self-revelation in Christ.

For the rest, this book might have been entitled, 'Sin and Duty,' but the title, 'Faith and Duty,' may act as a reminder that it is only the man of faith who knows what sin is, and if the man of duty does not live by faith, at least he lives 'beside it,' in a world which God has not left to human devices. Which may not be very well expressed, but on the whole it is a well-written and thoughtful book, owing much to the teaching of Professor John Baillie, who writes a cautious commendatory preface.

Living Issues in Biblical Scholarship.

Pentateuchal Criticism: Some Recent Trends.

By the Reverend D. R. Ap-Thomas, M.A., B.D., Bangor.

For some years past, most university students of the Old Testament have received lectures on the Pentateuch, which argue that Moses was not, and could not have been, the author of the Biblical books Genesis-Deuteronomy, in spite of long tradition.[1]

[1] *E.g.*, 2 Ch 25[4], Mk 12[26], 2 Co 3[15]; and the Babylonian Talmud, which gives the official Jewish view, as 'Moses wrote his own book (*sc.* Gen.-Deut.) and the book of Job' (*Baba Bathra*, 15a); cf. also Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, i. 8, 'of them (*sc.* the books of the O.T.), five belong to Moses, which contain his laws and the traditions of the origin of mankind, till his death' (Whiston's translation).

The main grounds usually propounded for disbelieving in the Mosaic authorship may be summarized under three heads as follows:[2] (1) *Personal considerations*: (i) the ascription of some particular sections within the Pentateuch to Moses specifically (for example, Ex 24[4], Nu 33[2]), carrying the implication that the remainder was not written by him; (ii) the constant reference to Moses in the third person, often in highly complimentary terms (for example, Nu 12[3]); (iii) the presence of

[2] See more fully the excellent sketches in H. H. Rowley, *The Growth of the Old Testament*, 16 ff.; A. Bentzen, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, ii. 10 ff., among others.

apparent inconsistencies or contradictions not easily attributable to a single individual. (2) *Literary considerations*: (i) many, if not all, the conflicting stories, laws, and institutions can be put into three or four reasonably self-consistent groups of material; (ii) what appear to be different versions of the same events would seem to have been combined by an 'editor' rather than by an 'author.' (3) *Chronological considerations*: (i) anachronistic references are found, for example, 'the land of the Hebrews' (Gn 40^{15}); 'Dan' (Gn 14^{14}; cf. Jg 18^{29}); (ii) it is argued that the mutually exclusive views of Israelite life and institutions found in the 'strata' or 'sources' disentangled from one another in the Pentateuch, answer to similar pictures of the community at different periods, as given in the historical and other books of the Old Testament.

The label usually tied to this view is 'Wellhausenism,' or it is called by the double title 'the Graf-Wellhausen theory,' after the names of two of the most able exponents of this view. Many other scholars helped in building up this theory, both before and after the two men named,[1] and there have always been opponents of these literary-critical methods and results;[2] but, by and large, it is some form of this theory which still holds the field.[3]

This four-source theory (the familiar J, E, D, and P—in that chronological order) has been assailed from within as well as from without. There being so little argument within the dominant critical orthodoxy about these four main sources, there have been a number of attempts to split them each up into various sub-divisions, for example, J^1, J^2, J^3, etc. That such sub-sources existed is, on the face of it, probable, even certain; but there is a danger that, by proceeding too far along such lines with ever increasing uncertainty as to detail, we may perhaps unconsciously relapse into some form of the 'Fragmentary Theory,' such as that of K. D. Ilgen who, according to Bentzen,[4] broke up the Pentateuch into seventeen independent documents. Maybe it appears to some that we have already reached this second Fragmentary Theory stage, and that view may be partly responsible for some of the apparently new trends in Pentateuchal criticism, particularly those associated with Uppsala in Sweden, since these trends appear to Bentzen[5] to be leading to some sort of Supplementary Hypothesis such as followed the first Fragmentary Theory.

It is not to be supposed, however, that these latest attempts to account for the Pentateuch simply leave us where we were a century or two ago. The new theories may not be as epoch-making or as final as their progenitors fondly hope, but that they have a contribution to make to our study of the problem, only the most bigoted would deny. One great advantage of this *traditio-historical* approach as opposed to the *literary-critical* (to use the cumbrous terms beloved of the protagonists), is that at last we are getting back towards a view of the Old Testament as one whole, whereas for far too long we have tended to make the divisions of the canon into rigid separators, and think of Law, Prophecy, and Poetry as having no connexion with one another in the life of Israel. The priest and the prophet, particularly, have been made to stand perpetually at loggerheads with one another.[6] That there was a frequent tension between them seems quite probable,[7] but the same is true as between one prophet and another;[8] and prophet and priest are often bracketed together for prophetic denunciation,[9] or are found together in normal association.[10] It has indeed been strongly argued that the prophet was an official member of the sanctuary staff.[11] Whether or no we accept this view, the Bible certainly calls Moses[12] both prophet and priest, and implies the same in the case of Samuel;[13] Jeremiah,[14] too, and Ezekiel[15] were priests as well as prophets according to the introductions to their respective books. The relationship of the prophet to the cult, however, is a problem, interesting and important though it is, which lies outside the scope of this article, and all that concerns us at this moment is to welcome a view of the Bible that tends to unify rather than to sunder its parts.

---

[1] See R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 135–141; A. Bentzen, *op. cit.*, 12–19; etc.

[2] *Ib.* [3] H. H. Rowley, *op. cit.*, 46.

[4] *Op. cit.*, 13.

[5] *Ib.*, 62; cf. Engnell, *Gamla Testamentet*, i. 181 ff., who speaks of 'this chaos in the literary critical market'; also A. Weiser, *Einleitung i. d. A.T.*[2], 65: 'Gunkel's line of study approximates to a kind of Fragmentary Theory.' (All translations in this article are my own unless otherwise noted; I have not added the originals for reasons of space.)

[6] Cf. J. Pedersen, 'Die Auffassung vom A.T.,' in *Z.A.W.*, viii. [1931] 170, with his reference to A. Kuenen, *De Godsdienst van Israel*, ii. 146; cf. also D. C. Simpson, in *Myth and Ritual*, ed. S. H. Hooke, p. x.–xii.

[7] Dt 18^{18-20}, Am 7^{12-17}, Jer 1^{18}; etc.

[8] 1 K 22^{23-25}, Jer $14^{13ff.}$ 28; etc.

[9] Is 28^{7}, Jer 2^{26}; etc. [10] Is 8^{2}, Jer 14^{18} $23^{33f.}$ 28^{1}.

[11] *E.g.*, by A. R. Johnson, *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel*; A. Haldar, *Associations of Cult Prophets among the Ancient Semites*; I. Engnell, 'Profetia och Tradition,' in *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok*, xii. [1947]; etc.

[12] Dt 18^{15} and Ps 99^{6}. [13] 1 S $2^{11.\ 18}$, 2 S $9^{9.\ 14}$.

[14] Jer 1^{1}, though 'of the priests' may refer to Jeremiah's father, here.

[15] Ezk 1^{3}.

What seems to have started off this wave of opposition to the Wellhausen theory is that it fitted in too neatly with the tidy, though now unpopular, nineteenth-century theory of evolution,[1] or we might even call it 'necessary progress' —in which 'primitive' has the double meaning 'early in time,' and 'imperfect in form,' whereas 'late' or 'later,' if they do not mean 'decadent' carry the implication of 'more perfect,' 'better.' This 'evolutionary' School of thought now has to put up a strong fight against the 'historical' School, for which 'the line of division runs not between primitive peoples and advanced nations but between one area and another,' in the words of A. M. Hocart.[2]

This rebellion against a theory of the strict chronologically successive development of culture is very often regarded, even by its holders, as an attack on the source theory of the Pentateuch,[3] and, as such, it has been somewhat mistakenly and prematurely welcomed by some of those who hold or wish to hold on to the belief in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Of those who reject the Graf-Wellhausen theory, E. Robertson[4] would still preserve the J, E, D, and P sources of that theory.[5] For him D (Deuteronomy) was 'an evolution of the first law and was given through the divinely inspired Samuel'[6] who acted as chairman of the committee of sanctuary prophets that compiled this, definitive, edition from the earlier J, E, and P, that were 'formulations of the laws at the different sanctuaries . . . in slightly variant forms. So also was it with the narratives of the patriarchs. . . . Thus came into being the Pentateuch' which 'was merely the fruit of the seeds planted by him' (*sc.* Moses).[7] Probably few orthodox critical scholars would now refuse to subscribe to this somewhat dilute form of Mosaic authorship, though whether the process of codification becomes more plausible by being put back from Ezra to Samuel is a different matter; and other scholars might conceivably find more tares among the Mosaic wheat than Robertson's reconstruction suggests.

An entirely different, and still more fiery, opposition to the Graf-Wellhausen scheme is associated with the name of Ivan Engnell of Uppsala; yet even he does not abolish 'sources' from his study of the Pentateuch, and he roundly asserts[8] that 'the fundamentalist view that Moses was the author is completely untenable.' He, too, separates Deuteronomy off from the preceding four books, for which latter he adopts the name 'tetrateuch,'[9] while joining up the former into a new pentateuch by adding as an integral part of one work the historical books, Joshua-Kings. Alongside of these two corpora he places the Chronicler's historical work, consisting of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah.[10] With this last, we have no direct concern here, nor really, at the stage which we can reach in this short article, with the Deuteronomic history book, since Engnell is at one with the orthodox Wellhausenian critics in separating it off from the preceding tetrateuch. His denial that any direct continuation of the tetrateuchal material (J, E, and P, to use familiar terms) is to be found in the historical books need not disturb the literary critic overmuch either, as others hold much the same view—particularly with regard to Judges-Kings.[11]

Where Engnell falls foul of the literary critics is in his sweeping generalization that 'the whole documentary theory . . . is nothing but a Western anachronism.'[12] Why does he say this? He is quite willing to admit that much water has flowed beneath the literary critics' bridges since Wellhausen's day,[13] and yet this is not enough for him; he would have us believe that the stream has now dried up, or that its course lies elsewhere, in fact that, 'the whole field of study has been completely revolutionized in many aspects since Wellhausen's day.'[14] The three new bases from which this

[1] J. Pedersen, *op. cit.*, 180; cf. I. Engnell, *Gamla Testamentet*, i. 10.

[2] *Kingship*, 143, as quoted by D. C. Simpson, *op. cit.*, p. xviii.

[3] But this is not necessarily true, see S. A. Cooke, *The 'Evolution' of Biblical Religion* as quoted by Rowley in *The Expository Times*, lxi. [August, 1950] 333, n. 8. 'It is necessary to remember that the Wellhausen *literary* theory of J, E, D, P is not to be confused with the reconstructions of history and religion based thereon by Wellhausen himself or others. Some are conservative, others radical, and others again are by no means "evolutionary."'

[4] *Investigations into the Old Testament Problem: The Results*, reprinted from *The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, xxxii. [1949] 1, and summing up seven earlier articles. I have not seen his book, *The Old Testament Problem*, announced for 1950.

[5] *Op. cit.*, 7. [6] *Ib.*, 25. [7] *Ib.*, 14.

[8] *Gamla Testamentet*, i. 168. The second volume of the *Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk*, which contains Engnell's article on the Pentateuch, is unfortunately not available to me, so that I have been able to use only his above mentioned Introduction to the Old Testament, published in 1945.

[9] *Ib.*, 212. [10] *Ib.*, 247.

[11] *E.g.*, R. H. Pfeiffer, *op. cit.*, 315: 'The use of the symbols J and E, to indicate the two old strands of narrative in Judges, is merely a matter of convenience and need not imply that the same authors wrote J and E in Judges as well as J and E in Genesis, respectively.' Cf. Rowley, *op. cit.*, 60, similarly.

[12] *Op. cit.*, 193. [13] *Ib.*, 178.

[14] *Ib.*, 183.

revolutionary movement aims its attack, one gathers, are : (*a*) a knowledge of Hebrew psychology,[1] (*b*) the fact that law in human society is old,[2] and (*c*) the discovery that information was conveyed orally as well as, or rather, more often than, in writing in ancient times.[3] In some respects it is rather surprising to find Engnell using this last argument to belabour the literary critics, since their reputed belief that writing came into use only at a comparatively late date has often been used by fundamentalists against the earlier Wellhausenians. Moreover, Engnell himself claims, if I have understood him correctly, that one of the results of recent archæological and linguistic researches has been to put *back* the date of the Old Testament as *written* literature.[4] Probably few literary critics would deny that oral tradition played an important part in the transmission of much of the Pentateuch, or that the person who did set down the material in writing used oral as well as written sources. Where they would disagree with Engnell, it seems to me, is in reconstructing the stages from the actual event (or its invention) to its present place in the Pentateuch. Engnell says that we cannot now ' separate out any " documentary sources," which certainly once upon a time did exist. It appears that the next task is to try to separate the smaller units and different traditions. This task is at present extraordinarily hazardous and can often give only approximate results.'[5] All he will allow is the separation of the legal material from the narrative, and then to sunder Genesis from Exodus-Numbers,[6] Deuteronomy having been first cut off as stated above.

However sympathetically we may regard the notion of such ' complexes,' each devoted to one theme, to accept Engnell's hypothesis (which, of course, owes very much to Pedersen of Denmark) as it stands, is to blind our eyes to the literary features, which cut across the bounds of these complexes, and which led to the documentary theory being formulated to take account of them. It is not good enough to dismiss deductions from ' variants, contradictions, and obscurities ' as showing ' a deficiency in the appreciation of the special character of Hebrew psychology,'[7] or to offer an alternative explanation of one rather weak example of an ' obscurity ' and then proceed, as if every case had been similarly disposed of, with the remark ' An obscurity exists only for Western logic.'[8] Of course, ' it is a self-evident fact that the same tradent can give " contradictory " reports ';[9] it is just as self-evident that an editor of literary sources can do the same thing, and has done it, or we should not have our present Pentateuch. But that is quite a different matter from saying that the same source will *produce* two contradictory reports. Contradictory reports and variants do imply, for the most part, different sources or traditions ; that these were originally oral is almost certain, but it is highly probable that they were written down at least at J, E, D, and P stages before attaining their present combination, on account of linguistic constants, which will more easily be maintained in a fixed literary form than in an oral medium once combination of different sources has taken place. These ' constants ' Engnell must perforce deny, but the fact that he must cite Dahse to help himself out—in spite of Skinner's total refutation of his position in *The Divine Names in Genesis*[10]—shows that here is one of the weakest joints in his whole armour.

The remaining bone of contention with which we have space to deal is the age of the Old Testament law codes. Engnell admits that many literary critics are willing to concede that P includes a good deal of older material ;[11] yet there is a good deal of force in his contention that Wellhausen considered Prophecy to be older than the Law ' since he, first and foremost, committed the fundamental error of not distinguishing between the literary or scriptural fixation of " documentary sources " and their date of origin.'[12] Such a confusion has, in practice, often taken place, and yet what does Engnell offer in its place ? However wrapped up, it seems to me in essence to be this : none of the material in P is later than 587 (the end of the monarchy), but P only attained its present form ' relatively late.'[13] If Engnell is willing to regard such points as, for example, the additional eighth day of the Feast of Tabernacles (Lv 23^{36}) as coming in at this ' relatively late ' date, then the quarrel between him and the literary critics will seem slighter. It is not the basic laws which the literary critic, when he is careful, regards as late, but the form of them which is in P as we have it, and especially the effect of the conglomeration of laws, together with the whole atmosphere of the legal and narrative material together, that seems to point so directly towards early Judaism

[1] *Ib.*, 189. [2] *Ib.*, 174. [3] *Ib.*, 184, 193.
[4] *Ib.*, 183. [5] *Ib.*, 213 f.
[6] *Ib.*, 213. [7] *Ib.*, 189, quoting Pedersen.
[8] *Ib.*, 192. [9] *Ib.*, 193.

[10] This point is dealt with at greater length by C. R. North in a forthcoming essay which I have been privileged to read in MS. Though gladly acknowledging my indebtedness to this essay, I have not thought it right to quote it either for or against my own views here expressed ; and I trust that I have in no way inadvertently appropriated here his right to prior expression of any opinion.

[11] *Op. cit.*, 177, n. [12] *Ib.*, 174.
[13] *Ib.*, 209, quoting Nyberg's article in *Världsreligionernas kärnord*, 121 f.

and a view of the political and religious history of Israel at variance with the evidence of the historical books and historical probability.

It may be objected that all this savours of that now apparently contemptible thing 'Western logic'; but, human beings being human beings, both West and East, now and earlier, surely it is better to have 'Western logic' than none?

I am well aware that much more might be said both for and against the views mentioned above, but reasons forbid this, as well as the introduction of the names of other protagonists, which has resulted in making Engnell shoulder perhaps more than his fair share of the burden; but his work so far shows that he has a broad shoulder, and we confidently hope that he will provide us with much more food for thought and consideration in the future. *Floreat veritas.*

Literature.

THE EXODUS.

I HEARD the President of the Historical Association say recently that the most fascinating problems for the historian are those which are insoluble, always assuming, of course, that they are problems worthy of serious examination. On this principle there is no problem in the field of Biblical history more fascinating than that of the Exodus. At the turn of the present century the view was general that the Exodus took place in the reign of Pharaoh Merneptah (*c.* 1220 B.C.). Twenty-five years ago the tide was running strongly in favour of a fifteenth-century date, and of an equation of the Hebrews with the Habiru of the Amarna letters. More recently, all sorts of new factors have emerged to complicate the problem, which seems as far from solution as ever.

A full-dress discussion of the problem has just been published by Professor H. H. Rowley, F.B.A., under the title, *From Joseph to Joshua: Biblical Traditions in the Light of Archæology* (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1948; Cumberlege; 12s. 6d. net). It is the third book by Professor Rowley which the present reviewer has reviewed in these columns this year, but no one supposes that even Professor Rowley can write three books in one year. This book embodies the results of researches extending over more than a quarter of a century. It is a work of almost incredible learning, with a 'List of Works Consulted' of twenty-four pages, and a wealth of footnotes, such as only Professor Rowley can write, covering every aspect of the problem. No scholar is more fair than he in giving publicity to views which he himself does not share.

The first of the customary three lectures deals with the Extra-Biblical Evidence, the second with the Biblical Traditions, and in the last Professor Rowley offers his own synthesis. Briefly, that synthesis is as follows: the migration of Abraham from Harran is dated, in accordance with the new 'lower' chronology, about 1650 B.C. Jacob is to be placed in the Amarna Age, *c.* 1400 B.C., when there was a pressure northwards from Kadesh of Hebrew groups, together with Kenite and other elements, the Habiru of the Amarna letters. Simultaneously there was pressure from the north of kindred groups, including Asher, Zebulun, Dan, and other Israelite tribes, the SA-GAZ of the Amarna letters. Simeon and Levi, moving up from the south, reached as far north as Shechem, but failed to hold it. During the following two centuries the two groups, the southern and the northern, established themselves more or less permanently in their habitations, while the central district was still unoccupied by the Hebrews. In the reign of Ikhnaton (*c.* 1370 B.C.) Joseph—in whose story there is a substantial amount of history—was taken into Egypt, where he rose to high office. A decade later there was a descent of Hebrews into Egypt, particularly some of those who had failed to hold Shechem. The Pharaoh of the Oppression was Rameses II. (*c.* 1300 B.C.). Moses was born *c.* 1290 B.C., and led the Israelites out of Egypt in the name of the Kenite God, Yahweh, in the reign of Merneptah. It was these who, under the leadership of Joshua, occupied central Palestine.

Professor Rowley explains that his discussion is offered 'as a purely academic study . . . as is fitting in the Schweich Lectures.' Nevertheless, his conclusions are of considerable importance for the study of Old Testament religion, in particular for the problem why the J source should assume that the name Yahweh was familiar to mankind from the earliest times, while E represents it as first communicated to Moses. Professor Rowley's thesis is that Moses first learned the name among the Kenites, while the southern group, which had a strong admixture of Kenites, who had been familiar with the name from time immemorial, knew nothing of any origins of Yahwism. This does not mean that Moses simply mediated Kenite Yahwism to the tribes he led. His own deep religious experience brought to the religion of his

adoption elements that were unique and epoch-making.

Professor Rowley says at the outset that he 'cannot hope to reach a solution which will be accepted as final,' that, indeed, 'it is safe to say that there will never be any general agreement on the chronological problems which lie at the base of our inquiry.' There is a growing feeling that the story as we have it in Genesis-Exodus is *Heilsgeschichte* rather than *Geschichte*—Pedersen calls Ex 1–15 'a cultic glorification'—and that we may never know exactly when and how the Exodus took place. That there was an Exodus is certain, but we are confronted with the paradox that although for Judaism and Christianity revelation is mediated through history, we can never hope to have a cinematographic reproduction of the history. All the same, if salvation is wrought through history, it is only natural and right that we should seek to recover as much of the history as we can. Professor Rowley's synthesis is, it goes without saying, attractive and reasonable, while the wealth of materials he has gathered is so ample that those who are unable to accept his particular synthesis are put into the way of finding all they need for formulating alternative syntheses of their own.

C. R. North.

DAVID CAIRNS.

In these days when the mass of us are rounded, like pebbles in a stream, into a dull conformity with one another, an original character who lives his life at first-hand and in his own way can be a godsend. Such an one was David Cairns, for thirty years a Professor, and ultimately the Principal of Christ's College at Aberdeen.

Like the best of us, Cairns had his minor flaws. From not a few of his opinions I, for one, vehemently dissented. But the sheer lovableness of the man stormed the heart, and won him troops of friends in all kinds of circles; while to not a few he was an oracle. And, indeed, there was much to admire. His mental gifts, his mind constantly teasing at big and central problems, the power and thrill of his speaking when he was in form, his unflagging interest in his fellow-mortals, his frank enjoyment of life, in spite of the ill-health that seriously handicapped him as a student, and of that grievous sorrow that allowed him only eight years of married life; in spite, indeed, of all that went to the making of his book, *The Faith that Rebels*; his passion for young men and women, and he himself, like Swedenborg's angels, seemed to get younger the older he grew; his fine talk, sharing royally with others the fruits of his thinking and wide experience, his humour—once he mislaid his engagement book, a major disaster for one with such crowded days, and he sent me a postcard consisting of a leering and triumphant devilkin making off at top speed, with, underneath his arm, a volume marked, My Engagement Book, and the question, Did he leave it with you?; his remarkable memory, dredging up good things out of all kinds of seas, and that winsome absentmindedness that occasionally assailed him—I have seen Cairns, in a railway carriage, warmly shaking a ticket collector's outstretched hand, exclaiming, 'I hope that you are very well!' And once he and Coffin of New York spent an afternoon with me. When they left, I saw a brand new hat of mine, which had just arrived, on Cairns' head. Yet, when I challenged him, he whipped it off, exclaiming indignantly, 'It has got Arthur John Gossip written inside it; surely that's all right?,' and was for making off till Coffin challenged him. But the basis of it all was a devoutness and reverence toward God. I have never forgotten evening prayers one night in his house, just Cairns and his housekeeper and I. After many years I can recall it with a curious exactness.

Happily he devoted some of his years of retirement to writing *David Cairns: An Autobiography*, originally intended for his children, but now published with a satisfying memoir by Professor D. M. Baillie (S.C.M.; 12s. 6d. net).

There is little in it about his achievements when he had fairly come into his kingdom, a kingdom, be it noted, slowly won. For as a probationer some fourteen congregations passed him by. And all his ministry was spent in a quiet country charge; though in the twelve years he was there some forty congregations, and among them some of the most important in the land, approached him, and several professorships were offered to him. This book, in the main, is the record of how the youth in the happy Border manse was formed, and grew to be the man that he became. The influences that moulded him were unexpected. Two books picked up on a railway bookstall played a not inconspicuous part. And the love of God broke through to him by the re-reading of a very simple work. But then, as Bunyan has it, he was not yet at his journey's end. One night in his lodgings in Edinburgh, under a gas jet, a horror of gross darkness fell on him, and it was a grim wrestle to that serenity of faith that became characteristic of the man.

His classes at Aberdeen were not large. But through the Student Movement, and so on, other doors opened to him on a wider service that took him far afield. It is all set down with an aptness of phrase, and with a modesty and honesty that move and make appeal. While broadcast through the book are wise findings upon life that clamour for quotation.

But one protest I must make. The smug individual in the frontispiece has only a remote resemblance to the rugged, untidy, human, likable Cairns I knew. But, happily, there is a speaking likeness of him on p. 129.

A. J. Gossip.

A CATCHWORD OR A CREED.

In a pamphlet of fourteen pages called *What is Existentialism?* (S.P.C.K.; 1s. net) Mr. Roland Bailey, M.A., Ph.D., makes a brave attempt to clarify what he describes as 'The Creed of Commitment and Action.' He notes carefully the distinction between the theoretical and practical meanings of existentialism, and he reviews usefully its operation of catchwords and slogans like choice commitment, freedom, responsibility, anguish, crisis, decision, remarking that 'some of its ideas may be commonplace if plainly stated'; and that 'for the most part existentialists make no effort to be understood.' And he is doubtful whether any essential relation can be established between the metaphysical doctrine and the practical ethics of a movement in which many varied trends claim to come under the common name 'existentialism.' Does the assertion that only those who live 'existentially' really live at all mean that an acceptance of this philosophy is an essential for right living?

In its practical aspect, if a moral standard is accepted, all the talk about crisis, anguish, commitment, responsibility, in spite of its froth and fury, is exactly in line with the Scriptural call for decision, with James' acid test 'faith without works is dead,' with Paul's dictum, Love is the fulfilling of the law, with the Marxian identification of theory and practice and the maxim that 'a thing is what it does,' and with the modern insistence that reality is found in movement and action. The preacher of any practical sermon could hot it up and give it a tang of modernity by peppering it, if he has not already done so, with these catchwords and exhorting his hearers to live 'existentially.' Indeed, is all this not in the Gospel promise, 'whosoever shall lose his life shall preserve it'?

But if the moral standard is not assumed, but is itself the subject of inquiry, what has existentialism to say as a philosophy. Theoretically it goes back to the scholastic distinction of existence and essence; and it plumps for existence as contrasted with the useless or illusory notion of essence; and for man existence means living in a constant movement and thrill of crisis, choice, and commitment. The more intensely and furiously such existential living is carried on the more really and truly does a man exist. But there is no ground for preferring one kind of existence to another. If that be said to make living a senseless chaotic nightmare, the answer is 'yes,' and reason and morality are just part of the nightmare. There is nothing but absurdity in the seething energy of existential living. Man thus, however, achieves his destiny. But there is no meaning in calling it either glorious or tragic.

So thinkers like Sartre. But, as Dr. Bailey shows, existentialists vary widely in their speculative doctrine. Marcel, a Christian thinker to whom he might have given more space, extracts from the idea of existence a proof that a self is already there before and outside the experience being entered upon; and this self is linked to values and realities which are thus brought into the business of existing. So he and others claim to be Christian existentialists.

Dr. Bailey's essay in fact suggests that even such an informative sketch as his can be only tentative.

R. W. Stewart.

SAINT FRANCIS.

Although there must be very many books upon the subject, the fact that Mr. John R. H. Moorman is a scholar, and an enthusiast, and knows his material through and through, gives him the right to add another to the list. And a fine book it is—*Saint Francis of Assisi* (S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net). As one reads again the heroic story, the old uncomfortable feeling of one's own tepidity and lukewarmness steals over one anew. Mr. Moorman quotes a vision of Pier Pettignano. 'He saw a superb procession of Apostles, Saints, and Martyrs, with the blessed Virgin at their head, all walking carefully and scrutinizing the ground with much earnestness, that they might tread as nearly as possible in the very footsteps of Christ. At the end of this pageant of the Church Triumphant came the little shabby figure of Francis, barefoot and brown-robed; and he alone was walking easily and steadily in the actual footprints of our Lord.'

But is this really so? Must we unemotional northerners concuss our stolid natures into conformity with what seems to some of us hectic and feverish and strained, if we are to give Christ full obedience?

If, in the Gospels, one man was bidden to sell all that he had, another, in the same Gospels, anxious to leave all and follow, was sent back to his home. And Christ accepted kindness and hospitality from people living lives that were not characterized by Franciscan poverty. Nor did He reprove them for their way of life. As everybody knows, even in Francis' own life-time the Church authorities modified his drastic rules.

And though this broke his heart, it may not have been declension. For, with all his wholeheartedness and arresting zeal, St. Francis, surely, was not always wise; and (may one not hint?) not always wholly Christ-like. But who am I to dare to criticise a saint so august?

A. J. Gossip.

Twenty able scholars, some of them with world-wide reputations, contribute to the symposium, *Fruits of Faith*, edited by Mr. J. Richard Spann (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press; $2.50), on the fruits of the Christian faith. The essays are of unequal merit, but the general level is high. The exposition of the contents of the faith is, however, more valuable than the suggestions as to its application. In his characteristic vein, Professor Nels Ferré, in the opening chapter, gives sound practical counsel on what ought to be the results of faith in a living God. Then comes a plea from Dr. Olsen for a broader Christology, and the following discussion of the Divine Presence is powerful and beautiful. The analysis of the doctrine of forgiveness is one of the most arresting chapters in the book. The Barthian-Niebuhr tendency in theology is both welcomed and deprecated, the writer thinking that it takes away 'the breastplate of hope and courage,' along with 'the mask of our complacency.' A thoroughly healthy article on the sacredness of all creative work precedes a final chapter in which an impassioned appeal is made for Christian citizenship on a world-wide basis.

Companion to the School Hymn-Book of the Methodist Church (Epworth Press; 21s. net) seeks to give interesting and instructive facts concerning the hymn writers and their hymns appearing in the Methodist Church's new school hymnary. The author is the Rev. William S. Kelynack, M.A., and his plan is to give in the first part of the volume short biographical details of the hymn writers (so far as their names are known), beginning with Abelard and ending with Zinzendorf; and in the second part, comments on the hymns. The short biographies are carefully compiled, and an effort is made to be as informative as possible where the writer is not well known. The comments deal with variations and quote tributes and succeed admirably in adding to the interest of the hymns. As Dr. Leslie F. Church says in the Preface, 'To realize the conditions under which Tilak wrote "One who is all unfit to count" is to sing the hymn with a new sense of its reality. To think for a moment of Francis of Assisi writing, ill and half-blind, in the tormenting heat of San Damiano, and then to sing his great hymn of thanksgiving (No. 32) would be a benediction.'

The Rev. Thomas Nicklin, formerly Warden of Hulme Hall, Manchester, has in *Gospel Gleanings* (Longmans; 21s. net) offered to his readers the fruits of many years' work on the critical and historical problems raised by the first four books of the New Testament. His method is modern, his conclusions are conservative. They are reached, it is claimed, in the light of the bearing of the recent finds of Egyptian papyri on critical questions, and of the effect on historical questions of the rehabilitation of the primitive Christian historians. The endeavour is to show by a re-examination of 'the comparison, concord, and chronology' of the Gospel narratives that there is an underlying sequence of events that is trustworthy. What in effect the author has in view is, in the old phrase, a 'Harmony' of the Gospels, with an outline of the story suggested by his harmonization. Here, stated at the outset, are the Postulates of the Harmony. (1) Mark's Gospel is in broad outline chronologically consecutive and historically trustworthy. (2) Matthew groups utterances of different periods together, but gives a more understanding reproduction of some discussions and sayings. (3) Luke's express claim (1^{1-4}) warrants us using his Gospel to guide us towards a correct chronological order, and the apparent fidelity of the 'Acts' to the words and thoughts of the speakers justifies us in treating the Third Gospel as also faithful in those respects. (4) Though John fuses into his narrative expository reflections and comments, the chronological and geographical framework of the incidents and the teaching recorded is historical. These postulates are defended in the course of the work. They are not to be regarded as 'the first improvisation of a theory to integrate the phenomena' but as the final statement of a theory arising out of the phenomena and alone capable of reconciling and co-ordinating the phenomena. The principle according to which the book is arranged is far from being obvious, and the sequence of the discussions is well indicated by the phrase, 'gleanings,' used in the title. It should be added that the whole book shows great learning and much insight, and that though the author is convinced of the strength of his argument he is well aware that he is on peculiarly controversial ground.

Mary of Bethany (Marshall, Morgan and Scott; 5s. net), by Canon Marcus L. Loane, M.A., Vice-Principal, Moore Theological College, Sydney, is a loving portrait of the Scriptural character whose name supplies the title of the book. A prologue on the Village of Bethany is followed by expositions of the three Scriptural passages (Lk 10^{38-42}, Jn 11^{20-44} and Jn 12^{1-8}) in which we learn what is to be learned concerning Mary. The expositions

are entitled, The Household, The Graveside, and The Supper respectively. They are on conservative lines, and are marked by a simple and clear style. The Epilogue (The Sinner of Galilee), based on Lk 7^{36} 8^{2} and Jn 11^{2}, repudiates any attempt to identify the 'woman in the city which was a sinner' with Mary of Bethany.

The State Prayers and Other Variations in the Book of Common Prayer (Mowbray; 6s. net), by Frank Streatfield, D.Phil., Proctor in Convocation, is a beautifully printed and illustrated volume. It seeks to examine in detail a number of different kinds of variations that have appeared in the English Prayer Book since 1662, when it reached the familiar shape. These are primarily changes in the wording proper due to the changes in the names of the Sovereign and the Royal Family entailed by the Births, Deaths, and Marriages at the Court of St. James; but certain Forms of Service were added by Royal Warrant, the text of these Warrants being printed in the Prayer Book when Forms of Service are concerned, but not for the change of names. This usually means one such Warrant for each reign. The minor alterations that have been added without any authority at all are always, or almost always, only such as conform to current taste in spelling and the like. Much learning and great carefulness have been expended in the compilation of this work.

This reprint of *Categorical Imperatives of the Christian Faith*, by the Rev. G. Campbell Morgan, D.D. (Oliphants; 5s. net), a book published nearly twenty years ago, is justified. The standpoint is conservative, but not rigidly so. The title is, we think, unfortunate, as Kant's understanding of the phrase 'categorical imperative' has very little to do with the contents of this book, and the first chapter, with its formal but distant acknowledgment of the claims of philosophy, contributes very slightly to an otherwise valuable book, in which the effectiveness of the appeal increases with every page. The discussion of the Deity of Christ is especially moving and convincing, although certain unnecessarily dogmatic statements and inadequate references to other religions might have been omitted with advantage. The chapters on the centrality of the Cross and the ministry of the Holy Spirit are beautiful in conception and phrasing, and devotionally inspiring.

The Passions of Men (Question Time in Petticoat Lane and Hyde Park), by the Rev. A. Jeans Courtney, is published by Messrs. Skeffington and Son (12s. 6d. net). In a prefatory commendation by the Bishop of London it is characterized as one of the most important of modern contributions to popular apologetics; and in one by Sir Thomas Malony, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Dublin, a Roman Catholic, as a most valuable commentary on problems of to-day troubling the souls of men. Mr. Courtney succeeded Mr. Kendall (also a Methodist minister), who along with Father McNabb (a Roman Catholic priest) spoke for nearly twenty years with great force and effect from a stand in Hyde Park. The meetings were under the auspices of the Public Morality Council, which represents all the churches. Mr. Courtney, who has addressed the meetings and answered questions regularly for several years, records in this work the types of questions asked and the answers given. The arrangement of the subjects does not appear to conform to any particular systematic scheme, but there is no doubt as to their topicality. Here are the titles from some of the chapters: Causes of Immorality, Morality and Religion, Problems of Providence, Drink, War, Faith and Science, Contraceptives, Marriage and Divorce, Prayer and Faith-healing, Immortality, The Existence of God. There is also no doubt as to the clearness and relevance of the treatment of the subjects raised. And one conspicuous and useful feature of the work is the constant reference to popular contemporary discussions in books and magazines; in this sense the work is nothing if not up-to-date. We bespeak for it a wide circulation.

The Rev. Arthur F. Smethurst, Ph.D., M.A., B.Sc., does not claim originality for his little book, *Convocation of Canterbury* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 9d. net), which gives an unadorned statement of the history of the Convocation, of its constitution and of its main activities. Incidentally there are comments on the participation of the laity and on relationships with Parliament. It is not a thrilling narrative, but it will be very useful to those who are closely concerned with the functioning of this ancient deliberative body. One item in the historical survey is intriguing. According to the author, Convocation took full responsibility for the compilation and authorization of the Prayer Book of 1662, but yet in 1927 Parliament had to be appealed to for authorization of a Revised Prayer Book. The reason assigned for the contradiction is that in 1662 the Prayer Book was attached as a schedule to the Act of Uniformity, and the grasp of Parliament thus permitted was never relaxed. Thus it came about that the Act which in 1662 caused such acute distress to those outside the Church of England was the distant cause of internal distress almost three centuries later.

The Authority of the Bible To-day.

By Professor W. Robinson, M.A., B.Sc., D.D., S.T.D., Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham.

In all the great Protestant Confessions of the sixteenth century the authority of the Holy Scriptures is given a supreme place as a standard of judgment on Church belief and practice. But what does this mean? Especially, what does it mean for us who live in the post-critical age? Does it mean, for instance, that the Bible, and especially the New Testament, is a kind of rule-book in which we shall find an answer to every question we ask about the Christian Faith or about Church order and forms of worship? The return in our day to Biblical theology makes it imperative that we should try to answer this question.

The Biblical scholarship of the past one hundred and fifty years has thrown much light on the kind of answer we are able to give to this and other questions. It has been shown that the Bible contains a number of documents judged by the Church to reflect the mind of Christ and His Apostles, and finally gathered into a Canon or rule by which all subsequent developments in Christian faith and practice were intended to be judged. More recent scholarship has shown that behind both Church and Bible there is the gospel, the 'good news' about God, God's saving acts in Christ Jesus, foreshadowed in the Old Testament and recorded in the New Testament, out of which both the Church and the New Testament sprang. It is this which is supremely the 'Word of God' by which the word of man is judged. It has been the understanding of this insight which has resulted in the past thirty years or so in the welcome return to Biblical theology, a return which is seen, not only in Protestant churches, but in Catholic churches, even in the Roman Catholic Church.[1] It is the gospel which is the 'given thing,' prepared for in the redemptive activity of God through His people, Israel, the record of which we have in the Old Testament; and effected in the saving work of Christ and its results in the formation of the 'New Israel,' the record of which we have in the New Testament. All this is laid hold of by the man of faith. To the man of 'not faith' the Bible is no more than a record of interesting events in the life of a somewhat obscure and unimportant people, and a mine of archæological and mythological lore. For him it contains some great literature mixed with some very poor literature; some elementary and some advanced moral codes; and throws a flood of light on primitive and sub-primitive religion. But it does not in any sense contain the record of the saving acts of God, which is what the Bible itself so often means by the expression 'the Word of God.' This is alone grasped by the man of faith.

This means that we must distinguish between two uses of the Bible. First, its use as a set of historical documents, which, like other historical documents, throws light on the beliefs, worship, and life of ancient peoples, and particularly on the life of the Early Church of the period in which the New Testament was produced. Here, we are using the Bible as historical evidence and we must use it as historians would use other source documents, applying to it the same critical methods, both historical and literary. Our criticism must be fearless and unbiased, unbiased in both directions—that of historical accuracy and that of being free from *a priori* suppositions as to the impossibility of this or that having happened. Secondly, its use as being the Word of God by which the Church in every age is judged. Here we recognize, as men of faith, that the Bible differs from all other source books for the historian in that it contains and conveys the Word of God to man, God's self-revelation, something quite different from man's groping after God; not only the saving acts of God in Christ Jesus with, in the Old Testament, the preparation for that, but the significance of that revelation in theological statements and its results in the pattern of worship and the life to be lived in the world by those who are in Christ Jesus.[2] This is the distinction which P. T. Forsyth made between 'revealed truth' and 'truths of revelation.' Revelation, as he maintained, is essentially the revelation of a Person to persons. Revelation, in the sense of 'revealed truth,' is an

[1] See the Encyclical of Pope Pius XII, *Divino Affiante* [1943], now published by The Catholic Truth Society under the title, *Stand by the Bible* (3d.).

[2] Professor Butterfield in his *Christianity and History* has pointed out the uniqueness of Christianity as an historical religion: 'All religions must have their founders, teachers, and prophets, and it does not matter if some of these are anonymous or if the historian proves that one or other was legendary. Traditional Christianity, however, claims to be an historical religion in a more technical sense; for certain historical events are held to be part of the religion itself—they are considered to have spiritual content and to represent the divine breaking in upon history' (p. 119). It is this quality which makes the Christian Scriptures different from the sacred books of other religions and gives to them that peculiar authority which they have, whilst at the same time it creates for Christians a special problem of interpretation.

existential experience.[1] But, the significance of that revelation in theological statement and in patterns of life and worship—that is 'truths of revelation'—must also be given value, especially that which appears in the New Testament, though all such 'truths of revelation' will need to be brought under the judgment of 'revealed truth.' The Church must be perpetually vigilant, must ever 'try the spirits.' It is 'the things of Christ' that the Holy Spirit takes and reveals unto us as He guides us into all truth, and that truth is only given to those who 'abide in the Word,' *i.e.*, in 'revealed truth.' The Holy Spirit is not the author of vagaries, but of validity. Furthermore, this revelation of God is *in community*. There is a vital relationship between God and the Israel of God, between Christ and the Body of Christ—the Church itself is part of the revelation.

The Church, therefore, whilst it is in many respects like other institutions, is in one respect quite unlike. It is, in the ontological sense, of Divine origin and import, possessing both life and form from the Divine source, and in every age animated by the Divine Spirit of God. In other words, as event its nature is eschatological. The significance of the New Testament at this point is, firstly, that it contains the original gospel out of which the Church sprang : [2] and, secondly, that it reflects the life of the Church in its Apostolic and creative period, making sure the true genius of Christianity, both in faith and practice. This way of looking at the matter makes obsolete the question of Bible versus Church, which in the nineteenth century was supposed to divide Catholic and Protestant forms of Christianity ; but it does not, as some Protestant scholars have assumed and some Neo-Catholic scholars have been glad to accept, make the New Testament irrelevant as a standard of judgment. It does mean, however, that we can no longer, after the manner of our forefathers, go to the New Testament and expect it to give us a complete answer to every question we shall ask about the faith, the structure, and the form of the Church. Many of the things *we* most want to know are not written down, precisely because they are taken for granted between the writer and readers of a letter. Very often obscure points in the New Testament are lit up for us by reference to later practices seen in contemporary and later Christian documents outside the New Testament, though in this case we shall need to bring such practices and beliefs under the judgment of the Word of God (in the sense described above).

[1] See *The Principle of Authority*.

[2] The word 'original' is not a question-begging word, precisely because the nature of the gospel is *act* and not *idea*. It is first of all something *done* and not something *thought* and *said*. God meets man in *event*.

Often in the New Testament we find ourselves dealing with a situation in which the very matter on which *we* need guidance is taken for granted between the writer of a document and his *contemporary* readers.[3] Neither is it possible to say that because the New Testament gives us no clear guidance about a certain belief or practice that the matter is of no importance. It is curious how this pre-critical way of using the New Testament often lingers on in even the most advanced and radical scholars, especially of Liberal persuasion. Whatever the significance of the Word of God, the Bible, which contains it, is not a series of books written for *our* edification in the twentieth century. At least the New Testament Epistles were written primarily for those who would receive them in the first century ; and because a doctrine or practice is taken for granted between the writer and his contemporary readers, it does not mean that it is of no importance. It may be of supreme importance just because it is taken for granted. The New Testament was not produced in a vacuum ; it was produced in the Church, and the Church, founded upon the gospel, was there before ever a page of the New Testament as we have it was written down.

But this does not mean that the Church is supreme and over-rules the New Testament, for behind the Church and the New Testament there is the 'given thing,' the gospel, out of which both arise, and the New Testament contains the only authentic account of the Church's earliest tradition as to what the gospel is. That is its supreme importance, especially as it contains it in at least four forms—gospel narrative, history (Acts), epistles, and apocalypse. To overstress the authority of the Church and to neglect the authority of the New Testament is a movement in the direction of *subjectivity* and not of *objectivity*—a movement which, if carried far enough, might quite easily reduce the Church to a *human* society and the Christian Faith to the level of a theosophy wholly divorced from historical event. It is not a movement *into history* as has often been thought, but a movement *out of history* into fantasy.[4] The

[3] This is especially true in the Epistles of the form of the Ministry. Whilst there is clear evidence as to the Church's beliefs—the faith once for all delivered to the saints—the Church's practice with regard to the Sacraments and the Church's way of life, there is very little evidence as to the way in which the Church was organized both locally and universally.

[4] This is what came near to happening in the Roman Catholic Church in the apologia presented for Catholicism by Loisy and Tyrrell in the early years of this century, and led to the condemnation of Catholic Modernism. It actually did happen in the Gnostic Churches of the Patristic period.

New Testament stands in the Church as a bulwark against all subjectivisms, the guardian of objectivity and 'given-ness' in the Christian system. There we find, not only the saving acts of God in Christ—the gospel itself—but the creative experience of the first Christians, witnessing to the life, faith and spirit of Apostolic Christianity, and this is the norm by which all future developments in Christianity must be tested. Recently R. R. Williams, Principal of St. John's College, Durham, has shown that in three ways the Scriptures are the bearer of Christ's authority: (1) they contain the classical and normative account of Christian origins, (2) they act as a salutary check upon the Church's vagaries, (3) they still are the medium through which God speaks to man.[1]

Nevertheless, to stress the authority of the New Testament as against that of the living Church guided by the Spirit of God, the Divine reality with historical continuity, is to make of Christianity a book-religion. In the hands of the unintelligent it turns the New Testament into a rule-book comparable to the rule-book of a Trade Union or other society, and gives full reign to *private* interpretations (which at least one New Testament Epistle disallows)[2] of a literalistic kind and often of a legalistic kind. It is from this kind of 'private' interpretation that most of the peculiar sects of modern times have arisen, and it is just this kind of attitude which has produced such absurdities as women not being allowed in churches without hats, the rejection of musical instruments, the prohibition of blood foods, and a hundred other things which in the course of history have driven sects to unlovely and warring attitudes. If we are to use the New Testament aright, it can only be by setting it within a *living* institution allowing for development of thought and the spirit of inquiry. But this will mean the banishment of strictly *private* interpretation; it will mean that no interpretation of Scripture is authoritative unless supported by the considered, qualified, and sanctified scholarship of the Church catholic. The great doctors and teachers of the Church in all ages must be appealed to.[3] This means that what the Church seeks in the Scriptures is not a *final* and *absolute* interpretation, but an *authoritative* one.

This emphasis on Church *and* New Testament, as over against Church *or* New Testament, is surely sound wisdom; for if we put reliance on the New Testament as conveying to us a 'sure Word of God,' we must remember that it is the Church which brings the New Testament to us and which gives it the position of canonical Scripture; and if we put reliance on the authority of the Church, we must remember that it was the Word of God which brought it into being, the Word contained in the New Testament, and which forever preserves it from becoming a mere human society, providing it with a theology which is not a mere philosophy of religion or a psychology of limited experience, and with an ecclesiology which is not the following of human caprice or taste.

What, then, is the kind of authority which the Bible has for us? Primarily it is the authority which it has because it contains and conveys the gospel, the saving acts of God in Christ Jesus. In it God speaks to us and we listen, God commands and we obey, God judges and we are redeemed, and this as nowhere else. For the Primitive Church, Jesus Christ was the Lord of life and glory, a faith which is registered everywhere in the New Testament, though in different theological terms in different parts of the New Testament. This Primitive Church has left us four records of His life and witness. They are not biographies in the modern sense of the term. They are Gospels announcing 'good news,' and this 'good news' is that God was in Christ Jesus reconciling the world unto Himself. These Gospels are themselves compiled from early traditions of the Church about Jesus of Nazareth and are capable of analysis into various literary and oral strands, which represent the early faith of the Christians. All of them affirm that He was a *real* Man who lived and died and rose again. But not one of them rests there. He was more than Man: He was the long-promised Messiah; He was the Son of God; He was the 'true Israel' of God, the Son of Man destined to bring in the 'New Israel'; He was the Word of God, and here we must remember that for the Hebrews 'word' was not so much a *spoken* word, an idea, as an *acted* word, something very concrete; he was God manifested in the flesh. Thus, His life, death, resurrection, exaltation, and coming again are definitive for judgment upon every Word of God or supposed Word of God. This means that the Bible itself in every part must be brought under the judgment of this Word of God revealed in Christ Jesus. The Old Testament, therefore, must be interpreted according to Christ, and this is precisely what the first Christians proceeded to do, which caused the split between the Church and the major part of the Synagogue. Christ, the living Word, stands above every written word,

[1] *Authority in the Apostolic Age.*

[2] 2 P 1^{20}. This is particularly apposite because, coming from this late spurious document, it shows that 'private' interpretation had already begun to work as soon as Apostolic authority had been removed.

[3] Most of the reformers can be quoted as rejecting private interpretation of this kind. In America, where it ran rife, it was rejected by Thomas Campbell in 1909, see *The Declaration and Address*, and if his advice had been taken Protestantism would never have run to seed as it did in the nineteenth century.

just as Christ, the Head of the Church, stands above the Church, and as Lord of history stands above all history. Written Word and Church exist, and exist in a mutual relation as interdependent, but both of them are subordinate to Him who is the informing actuality of authority. This dependence of the Christian life and faith on Jesus is stressed everywhere in the New Testament, both in Gospels and Epistles. He, in His human and risen life, is the Authority to whom we must turn again and again. The Church is always under reformation to this Norm. 'To live your life with Christ—to negate yourself for Christ—that is the norm.' [1]

This means that we must give ourselves anew to the study of the Gospels, not only the Synoptic Gospels, but the Fourth Gospel also, interpreting them by the light which we have in the rest of the New Testament, until the figure of Jesus stands as clearly before us as is possible, He who fulfilled the Law, bringing with Him the inexorable demand of purity, holiness, and love to God and man. There we shall find that norm of life whose foundation is humility, teachableness, and penitence. We shall give place in our lives, in our faith, and worship, 'to Christ who goes forward to His Passion, letting Him, in effect, become our *ego*, so that life thus realized in fellowship with Him becomes in the final sense life from the dead, the awakening and rising of a new personality.' [2] In like manner the judgment of this norm must be brought to bear upon every belief, every theological construction, every Church practice, every act of worship, every liturgy and every discipline which we seek to advocate in His Name.

[1] Professor W. Manson, 'The Norm of the Christian Life,' in *The Scottish Journal of Theology*, III. i. 38.

[2] *Ib.*, 41.

Karl Mannheim

By the Reverend Geraint V. Jones, M.A., B.Litt., Glasgow.

If the prophet's sphere is considered to be warning and illumination arising from diagnostic insight, of which there is plenty in his work, in this sense the eminent sociologist Karl Mannheim may perhaps be described as a modern prophet.

Karl Mannheim was born in Budapest in 1893; he studied at the University of that city, and then, as was customary in Germany and Austria, proceeded from one University to another, studying at Berlin, Paris, Freiburg, and Heidelberg, where he was appointed *Privatdozent* (a lecturer who is paid out of his fees and not by the University). From Heidelberg he went to the University of Frankfurt, where he was Professor of Sociology from 1930 to 1933, when he left on the advent to power of the National Socialists, and for the next twelve years lectured on Sociology at the London School of Economics. From 1945–48 he was Professor of Education in the University of London, and died at the age of fifty-five while still working at his, so far, unpublished book, *Essentials of Democratic Planning*, which he was writing for the Royal Institute of International Affairs. In addition to his major works (*The Task of Sociology in our Time* [1932], *Ideology and Utopia* [1936], *Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction* [1940], and *Diagnosis of our Time* [1943]), Mannheim contributed to *The Christian News-Letter*, spoke to Sixth Forms in a Broadcast series to schools, and wrote numerous articles on Philosophy and Sociology. He was a man of encyclopædic knowledge of his subject and of profound sociological insight, and his death in 1948 was the cause of dismay to those who looked forward to further contributions by him to the understanding and solution of the urgent problems of the time.

To describe Mannheim as a prophet is justified only if we take the broad view of the prophetic function which I have indicated; for the bulk of his more recent writings, at any rate those which are available in English, contain penetrating pronouncements on the mood of the age and its general economic and social tendencies. Although at times difficult to read, and therefore difficult to reduce to the compass of a lucid summary, his work rewards those who are prepared to apply themselves to it. Certainly parts of *Man and Society* and *Diagnosis of our Time*, though often suffering from over-concentration, repay any one who is ready to give them the attention which they deserve. Mannheim's great value to those who are alive to the modern crisis in valuations and to the fact that we are in an age of transition from unplanned to planned society consists of his being a Liberal who is concerned with the preservation, in an age of mass-society, of the fundamental Liberal values without which our Western society is doomed to an arid dictatorship of the Left. Like that other distinguished refugee, Professor Ferdynand Zweig, formerly of Cracow (see his *Planning of Free Societies*),

Mannheim sees that a planned society can only be saved from what it is likely to become by a readjustment of Liberal views to modern conditions, and he reminds us, as Christians, that we can contribute little to the solution of modern tensions until we understand the mental and social background resulting from the combination of modern techniques with the emergence of mass-democracy as the dominant sociological factor of the age. We can take warning from a sentence from an article written for *The Christian News-Letter* in February 1945 : ' What we have to avoid at all costs is the academic aloofness which finds life sublime only in a kind of stratosphere where our minds are kept safely at a distance from suffering and vulgarity, and from the world of daily contacts in which people are jealous and hate one another and things really hurt.' It is futile to imagine that things are other than they are, that ideologies are independent of their social-economic setting, and that we can return to an obsolete nineteenth century Liberal-Capitalism and to anarchic individualism in economics ; and the sooner we realize it the better. Such ideas as ' freedom ' and ' responsibility ' do not arise *in vacuo*, and there is little point in acting as if they do. The conditions in which ' freedom ' is exercised change ; hence its expression must change too. Freedom in the nineteenth century meant freedom from interference by the State ; to-day it means, in Mannheim's view, control of our social environment. Yet somehow or other these two notions have to be reconciled if the virtues of the former kind of freedom are to animate the latter.

Mannheim begins with the contention that the contemporary crisis, both in valuations and in the economic-social sphere, is the accompaniment of the change from Liberal or unplanned to planned order. He rejects both Marxist and Fascist forms of planning (the only two forms we have known hitherto), advocating, though in a different manner, the ' third way ' which the Swiss political economist, Wilhelm Roepke, wrote about in his book, *Die Gesellschaftskrisis der Gegenwart* (*The Contemporary Social Crisis*) [1942] : the way of democratic control of planning combined with the maximum decentralization. ' We are living in an age of transition, from *laissez-faire* to a planned society,' Mannheim wrote in *Diagnosis of our Time*. ' The political society that will come may take two shapes : it will be ruled either by a minority in terms of a dictatorship, or by a new form of government which, in spite of its increased power, will still be democratically controlled.' Modern techniques have made absolute control easy to achieve ; a democratic society must understand in which spheres there should not be interference but rather scope for spontaneity, and which require more central control than others. That there can be no escape from planning is not to be denied : ' our society is forced into planning by a heritage of regulations from the past.' It is now a question of how much planning, where, and what is to be the controlling spirit.

This is really the crucial issue from which we cannot escape, and it is important that the transition should be made with the minimum of dislocation, especially as political and social stability is continually threatened by the irruption of the irrational into an order such as the political-economic which is essentially rational. The typical modern phenomenon is the emergence of mass-democracy into an age of technics : of what Mannheim calls ' fundamental democratization,' combined with growing interdependence and the impact of the hitherto disinherited masses on politics and culture : a situation which has been made more critical by the reduction in the size and influence of former select groups (' *élites* ') and the supplanting of them by social groups with a different outlook and little tradition. This change in the composition of the dominant groups is one of the most significant factors of our time ; for the outlook of formerly depressed groups tends to become the prevalent outlook of the whole society. The question is, therefore, who is to be dominant in an age of planning, and how the various groups can be integrated in the society which is taking shape without the sacrifice of essential freedoms. If it is true that ' the masses always take the form which the creative minorities controlling societies choose to give them,' as Christians with a Liberal-Western tradition we should be particularly concerned about the implications of this statement, and Mannheim wisely says that the best thing to do is not to frustrate planning in principle (which will play into the hands of the dictator-type and exacerbate social relationships) but to co-operate and leaven the process with the distinctive spirit of Liberalism as understood in the changed situation. He reminds us too that new forms of freedom ' are always rejected until men have ceased to think in terms of an earlier phase of social existence.'

For the sake of conciseness I quote a few passages from *Man and Society* without comment.

> ' Planning means a conscious attack on the sources of maladjustment in the social order on the basis of a thorough knowledge of the whole mechanism of society and the way in which it works. It is not the treatment of symptoms but an attack on the strategic points, fully realizing the results. . . . It is not contrary to the nature of a free democratic society if we maintain that

the most satisfactory arrangement would be to fit a sphere of free creative initiative into a planned institutional framework. In the future this sphere of free creative activity must always be guided so as to guard against the possibility of distortion and breakdown. . . . And further, it must constantly be kept in mind that the transition from a minority democracy to an organized mass-democracy does not take place spontaneously but must itself be planned.' 'A democratically planned society must thoroughly develop the new forms of freedom, but once developed it must defend them with the same zeal that any society shows in the defence of its fundamental principles. Democracy ought to instruct its citizens in its own values instead of feebly waiting until its system is wrecked by private armies from within. Tolerance does not mean tolerating the intolerant.' 'From now on men will find a higher form of freedom in allowing many aspects of their individual lives to be determined by the social order laid down by the groups, provided that it is an order which they themselves have chosen. At the stage we have just reached, it seems to be greater slavery to be able to do as we like in an unjust or badly organized society than to accept the claims of planning in a healthy society which we ourselves have chosen' (pp. 114, 353, 377).

There must be freedom, Mannheim insists, on the level of planning, and the ultimate aim of planning should not be the enforcement of a dogma but the achievement of freedom; indeed, in the 'mass-society' of this age freedom will be more needed than ever before.

Although primarily a sociologist, Mannheim made some attempt to approach the questions of planning, techniques, and social change in their impact on Christian ethics, a subject which he discussed with Christian friends in a war-time paper entitled *Towards a New Social Philosophy*. The re-shaping, or rebirth, of society, he maintained, could only be adequately furthered by 'the deepest sources of human generation.' There must be a deeper and more unifying principle of spiritual integration than economic aims, and 'only a generation which has been educated through religion, or at least on the religious level, to discriminate between immediate advantage and the lasting issues will be capable of accepting the sacrifice which a properly planned democratic order must continually demand from every single group and individual in the interests of the whole.' 'Only if the rebirth of religion, both in terms of a popular movement and of regenerated leadership, coincides with the forthcoming social transformation can it happen that the new democratic order of this country will be Christian.' Mannheim is of the opinion that ethical rules must be tested in the social context, and that Christian attitudes must not be laid down as rigid rules to be applied absolutely but rather as concrete symbols transferring the intentions of Jesus into varying situations. Somehow the Christian has to retain his basic experience and at the same time be intellectually aware of the changes in modern environment at a time when he knows that Christian ethics are increasingly out of harmony with the social pattern. Christian action, therefore, consists of two elements — the one conservative, concerned to retain the symbols and experiences necessary to the spiritual redemption of society, and the other progressive, aware of the changes in progress and eager to provide them with an underlying unity of valuations which distinguish the Christian approach from the moral neutrality of psychology and sociology. At all costs we must be spared 'mechanised barbarism'—'the antagonist whose glaring shadow looms across our world.'

It is not possible within the compass of a short article to examine Mannheim's social analysis more closely. To sum up: his main contention is this. For good or ill, the *laissez-faire* Liberalism of uncontrolled Capitalism is over and we have to adapt ourselves to an age of planned economy and to the mental adjustments which this involves. The character of the society emerging from this era of new techniques will depend on the motives and the spirit animating those who are creating it. Democracy must become militant and self-conscious and abandon its unconcern about valuations and must be prepared for discipline and co-operation, for it should not be satisfied with merely mitigating conflicts and maladjustments but concerned with the growth of basic agreement. It must also have a positive attitude toward freedom so as to eliminate not only the irrational element from politics but also save a planned society from domination by opportunistic groups. The Christian must be fully aware of the far-reaching character of contemporary social change if his theology and his ethics are to have any relevance to the human situation. It is useless to utter high-sounding phrases if there is no framework in which they can be made to work.

'An ethical attitude,' Mannheim wrote in *Ideology and Utopia*, 'is invalid if it is orientated with reference to norms with which action in a given historical setting, even with the best of intentions, cannot comply. . . . The moral interpretation of one's own action is invalid when, through the force of traditional modes of thought

and conceptions of life, it does not allow for the accommodation of action and thought to a new and changed situation and in the end actually obscures and prevents this adjustment and transformation of man' (p. 84).

To the orthodox Christian theologian this may suggest that Mannheim was too much of a moral relativist, and elsewhere he expresses his disapproval of the absoluteness of moral ideas, which are historically conditioned and continuously developing; indeed, all forms of Utopianism are sociologically and historically conditioned; yet Mannheim protests also against modern *Sachlichkeit*, for the 'complete elimination of reality-transcending elements from our world would lead us to a matter of factness which ultimately would lead to a decay of the human will' (*ib.* 236).

The concept of freedom, too, must be thought out afresh if the reality of freedom is to be preserved. For the Christian it is the foundation of a tolerable society, and unless a free society controls the sources of power, a dictatorship will do so, which will mean the end of freedom.

Mannheim's thought is both challenging and illuminating. It is for the theologian to accept the implications of the challenge as well as the illumination.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

'Christians, Awake.'

By the Reverend Donald S. Ching, Colsterworth, Grantham.

'God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son.'—Jn 3^{16}.

There was once a man who was so very tall that if he got on an ordinary-sized horse his feet nearly touched the ground on both sides. He used to complain that one of his chief difficulties in life was to find a horse that was high enough for him to mount. To-day we do not mind much if we cannot find a horse of the right size for us, for there are now bicycles, buses, motor-cars, and trains. But he lived at a time when people who wished to travel had to depend very much upon horses.

This tall man travelled a great deal. He was born at Kersall Cell, Manchester, but he did not spend all his life there. When he was a young man he became a student at Cambridge, and he rode on horseback from Manchester to Cambridge at the beginning of every term, and back again from Cambridge to Manchester at the end. If his horse was the wrong size for him, those journeys must have been very uncomfortable!

When he had finished his studies at Cambridge he travelled farther still, for he went to a place in the south of France called Montpelier, where he studied medicine. So when he came back to England again he was a doctor. He did not settle down as a doctor, however; perhaps the difficulty of finding a horse of the right size made him dissatisfied with a doctor's life, for in those days a doctor had to visit his patients on horseback. Or perhaps it was just that his mind was so restless that the study and practice of medicine was not enough for him. Whatever the reason may have been, he invented a system of shorthand and made his living by teaching it. Shorthand, as you probably know, is a special kind of writing which is used a great deal, especially by newspaper reporters and typists in offices. It looks queer and squiggly, and only people who have studied it can read it or write it, but it is much quicker than ordinary writing.

This tall man who invented his special system of shorthand and taught people to use it, could write longhand, too, of course. That is to say, he wrote the same kind of writing that you and I use. His diaries and letters were so interesting and so well written that they were later published for everyone to read, and he also wrote articles for a famous magazine called *The Spectator*. When he wrote for *The Spectator* he used a pseudonym; that is to say, he signed a pretend-name instead of his proper name. He was a merry man, and he knew that his friends were amused because he was so long and thin; so he signed his articles with the name 'John Shadow.' But his real name was Dr. John Byrom, and his writing, in both prose and poetry, was very good. John Wesley said of him, 'He has all the wit and humour of Dr. Swift, together with much more learning, a deep and strong understanding, and above all, a serious vein of poetry.' He certainly was a very talented man —Master of Arts at Cambridge, Doctor of Medicine at Montpelier, Fellow of the Royal Society, Inventor of a System of Shorthand, Author, and Poet.

Just two hundred and five years ago he promised his daughter, Dolly, that he would write something specially for her as a Christmas present. Sure enough, when she came down to breakfast on Christmas morning, 1745, there was an envelope

beside her plate, and in it a sheet of paper headed, in her father's handwriting (longhand, not shorthand), 'Christmas Day for Dolly.' Below this heading was that lovely Christmas hymn which we all know—'Christians, awake, salute the happy morn.' Her father had written it specially for her!

Yet though it was Dolly's own Christmas present, it belongs to all of us. This Christmas present that was given to one little girl so long ago is a Christmas gift to everybody now. Dr. Byrom gave it to Dolly, Dolly gave it to her family, her family gave it later to a man called James Crossley. From him it passed to Chetham's Hospital, Manchester, and then it was published in *The Manchester Mercury*. Now it is printed in many, many hymn books, and is known and sung by countless people in many lands.

What are you going to do with your Christmas presents this year? Do you think of Christmas presents as something you get, or as something you can share? It is certainly very exciting to get presents, but it is a far richer joy to give them away again by sharing them. The greatest Christmas present of all is the very first one that was ever given—the baby Jesus whom God gave because He loved the world. The greatest joy in that gift is in sharing Jesus with every one else. How many ways of sharing Him can you discover?

'Hard—But Worth It!'

By the Reverend George Johnstone Jeffrey, D.D., Glasgow.

'Sit still, my daughter.'—Ru 3[18].

For a healthy, stirring boy or girl here is surely one of life's hardest tasks! What torture it is for a little child to be penned up in a railway carriage on a long journey—with cross old folks who have never been young! On holiday this year there was a tiny girl in the pew with me. Her mother stood her on the seat to sing all the hymns and kept her attentive to the reading and the prayers. But as she was being helped down from her perch after the third hymn she looked up into her mother's face with a pitiful appeal—'Do we get out *now*?' Alas, the sermon was only beginning!

Now we old folks really *have* been young. We understand. We give you every chance to romp and run and play. We know ourselves how hard it is to sit still. I read the other day of a farm in America which had been badly damaged by a storm—what they call a tornado. The farmer's wife wrote asking a friend to keep her small son while the damage was being repaired. She kindly agreed. But in three days the farmer's wife got a telegram which read: 'Returning Tom. Send the tornado!'

There are three ways in which a child must learn the art of sitting still. The first thing this text seems to say to you is: 'Sit still **and work.**'

You boys and girls will grow up to find that work is a very big portion of our life, and it will be wise to be happy in it. I am sure that when Jesus worked at the carpenter's bench He often sang! And to be happy in our work means that we must learn to sit still, to sit down dourly, and doggedly at our tasks. Some of you may get the chance to learn the piano. See that you take it! It will bring much happiness to you and to others some day, *but you must learn to sit still* and not grudge the hard work! I sent my own boy and girl, when they were perhaps too young, to a fine teacher of music. One day I asked my boy how he was getting on with his piano teacher. His reply was enlightening! 'He's really very decent, Daddy, *he knows we hate it*!' Needless to say, there are no Paderewskis in my family. But you are going to be different. You are going to sit down, and sit still and practise, and one day the drudgery will be over and it will be well worth while, and you will be glad you earned the rewards of sitting still.

Then we must try to sit still **and wonder.** There are a great many older folks who go about in God's amazing world—and they look utterly bored. They have lost the child's beautiful sense of wonder. If the stars failed to come out in the sky, if the flowers did not appear on the earth, you feel they would scarcely miss them! A great man once said, 'If the stars came out only once in a thousand years, how men would stare and gasp and wonder.' And if the flowers came out only once in fifty years, wouldn't we hear about it? What a world it would be if there were no Christmastide, no lovely Christmas story, no holly and mistletoe, no gleeful parties or happy faces and joyous homes. Whatever else life may take away from you, boys and girls, try to keep this sense of wonder. It will make your lives rich and great.

And lastly, learn to sit still **and worship.** You boys and girls must have noticed this strange thing about your fathers and mothers. For six days in the week they are busy—working, travelling, above all talking. But one day in the week and in one place only, you see them sitting still, silent, serious yet quietly glad. Except when they rise to sing the hymns they are as still as they can be. I am sure you have wondered at this. Thomas Carlyle said that one of the deepest impressions of his childhood was watching his father and mother in God's house. 'The highest I knew on earth I saw bowed down before a Higher in Heaven.' As you

grow, you will learn the wonder of worship, of communing with God, of lifting up your hearts to Christ, of breathing in His Holy Spirit, and life will cease to be a common, petty, fussy thing but something deep and calm and beautiful. Listen to a poet describing this loveliness.

> O sweeter than the marriage-feast,
> 'Tis sweeter far to me,
> To walk together to the kirk
> With a goodly company!—
>
> To walk together to the kirk,
> And all together pray
> While each to his great Father bends,
> Old men, and babes, and loving friends
> And youths and maidens gay!

The Christian Year.

Christmas Day.

Christmas Journeying.

By the Reverend H. G. Newsham, M.A., Edinburgh.

'There came wise men from the east to Jerusalem, Saying, . . . we have seen his star. . . .'—Mt $2^{1, 2}$.

Christmas is the festival of home and family life. Its altar is the hearth. The highways, the railways, the skyways will be crowded with travellers eager to spend Christmas amongst their own folk. Even Mr. Molotov and Mr. Vyshinsky have been known to hurry Moscow-wards, across continent and ocean, 'to be home for Christmas.'

The reason for Christmas having become inextricably linked with home and the family circle is not far to seek. Nevertheless, it is something of a paradox. For, in actual fact, the most arresting feature of the Gospel story is that of 'home-leaving' and not of 'home-coming.'

Think, for instance, of Joseph and Mary. They journey to Bethlehem, it is true, in order that their child might be born in the ancestral city, 'Joseph being of the house and lineage of David.' But in no other sense was it a home-coming. There was no one there, no relative or friend, to offer accommodation. They had to make shift in the cowshed of the village inn. Their home, their kindred, their friends were all in the North.

Or think of the three Wise Men who came from the East. Tradition has embroidered the tale with many a fascinating fancy. It isn't the Gospel that tells us the land from which they journeyed, whether Arabia, Persia, India, or elsewhere. But they had certainly travelled far. They had left 'their own country.' They had crossed the frontier of a foreign land. They had left home and kinsfolk and friends behind. They had fared forth on this epic adventure, not knowing when or where they would reach their journey's end.

And what of Christ Himself, if we may in all reverence ask the question? Admit as fully and frankly as we must that all our speech and thought about the Incarnation can be but pictorial and symbolic, nevertheless we are convinced it lies at the very heart of Christmas to think of it as an act of Divine outreaching for us men and for our world. I know as well as any so-called rationalist that heaven is not a place above the stars. But I know also that if any such prosaic consideration is allowed to deprive me of the right to sing 'Love came down at Christmas,' Truth is not being served. For the vital matter is that at the Manger a great gulf was bridged; a vast distance was overcome; the Eternal came in fashion as a man and humbled Himself for our redeeming. Phrase it as you will, you cannot think of the Manger and Bethlehem, of Nazareth and Jerusalem, as the real home of Christ. On this earth, as Jesus Himself said, He was homeless. The Manger meant a far journey; a journey through a distance which our minds, imprisoned in space and time, cannot adequately conceive; a journey from the angelic hosts to bigotry, and mercenary mindedness, and duplicity, and corruption. We can only worship and adore.

Not home-coming, then, but home-leaving, is the dominant theme of the Gospel account of the Nativity. Whether you think of the Holy Child in the cradle, of Joseph and Mary, of the Magi, or even of the shepherds leaving their sheepfolds, it is a story of leaving the familiar for the strange. It is a story of travel, of pursuing a vision, of adventuring greatly to follow a star.

All of which raises an urgent question: Can you and I hope to come to Bethlehem unless we also are ready to make a journey, perhaps a very far journey? Can we truly worship at the Manger unless we are praying to be possessed of that same spirit which was in Christ Himself; that spirit which brought Him in this selfless act of Divine Descent to our dim-shadowed earth; that spirit which animated Him all the days of His life and was disclosed supremely when He took a towel and washed His disciples' feet and then trod the road to Golgotha in that culminating sacrifice of fathomless love? Was it not a pilgrim spirit, in this sense of the phrase, that He made the test of those who would be His followers? Leave your old familiar ways if need be. Shut down the lid in your office; leave your nets; leave even father and mother, if it be necessary, for My sake . . . and come, follow Me. How can we think to follow Him who spoke such uncompromising words if there be no reality whatsoever of journeying and pilgrimage within our lives at all?

When we sing the joyful Christmas hymn

As with gladness men of old
Did the guiding star behold

let us try to keep in mind the searching thing it intends. For we have certainly seen the star in the East. The fame of Jesus has reached our ears. We know something of the difference He has made in the world. We know the shining difference He has made in our own lives. We believe, too, that the difference He is yet destined to make in the world and in our own still stained and self-centred lives will make all He has done but a little thing compared with His finished work, when 'he shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied.' All this, and more, we know. His star is in the heavens and we behold it. It shines there all the more brightly because of the absence of any other star or hope in our sky to which a modern man may fix his gaze. Far more plainly now than in the days of the Magi I see the star in the East. I know it risen for some Divine event that shall not be frustrated, though it be delayed.

But let there be no mistake. This is not to have found the Christ. To have seen the star, to be arrested by it, to wonder at it, even to be certain that it is a portent; all this is one thing. But quietly to take one's staff and slip on one's shoes and *follow the star* whithersoever it may lead, that is quite another thing. Jesus has never yet been found by any unprepared for personal pilgrimage. There must have been many others who saw the brilliant luminary in the velvet of the Orient night and who said with awed amazement, 'There's a strange star in the sky that I've never seen before.' And no doubt they gazed at it on many a following night until it either became familiar and impressed them no more, or it sank beneath their horizon. Not to them, or to any of their like, did the supreme discovery come. It came only, so the inspired idyll tells us, to the three who followed the star out even of their own country until at length they came to Bethlehem.

What, then, is the journey you and I must be ready to make if we are not merely to behold the star but to follow it? What is 'our own country' we must be willing to leave, even though it be to return to it by another way, with a new vision and a new dedication? That is a question no generalizations can possibly answer. The answer will be peculiarly personal, individually unique. One thing only I know with certainty. The star is there to guide if we are humbly prepared for its guidance. It may mean a far journey from the kingdom where self is enthroned and pride is a powerful commander-in-chief. It may be a journey from the sin we have not yet decisively, now and for ever, renounced. It may be a journey from class prejudice; from religious or social intolerances; from complacent self-righteousness; from hard-fisted, ungenerous, unsympathetic living. It may be a journey clean away from that hampering sense of injustice, of self-pity, of rankling disappointment, which has been poisoning life for years. It may be a journey from the country where hope and expectation have ceased to a kingdom where life is full of boundless possibilities, and death is known to be a Door opening into a Father's House. It may be—but I cannot say. You alone can say. I only know the star would lead us onwards, burning bright. God grant us grace to follow whithersoever it leads. So shall our Christmas worship bring us to our own hour of discovery and adoration.

Star of wonder, star of night,
Star with royal beauty bright
. . . . .
Guide us to thy perfect light.

SUNDAY AFTER CHRISTMAS DAY.

Bearing Up and Hoping for the Best.

BY THE REVEREND ARTHUR A. COWAN, D.D., EDINBURGH.

'God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able.'—1 Co 10[13].

A man, when asked how he feels about being moved on from the old year to the new, may reply: 'Oh, I am bearing up and hoping for the best.' It is the festive season, and he has a cheerful look, but is it merely a jovial pretence or is it a valid confidence? He should have such grateful memories of getting the strength to carry him through in the past as to feel sure that the God in whom he believes will never let him down in the future. Each succeeding year should have such thankful recollections that he can look forward without being nervous and flustered as to what will happen. 'God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able.'

As the old year closes, we remember how time and again, when we were apprehensive, we were not strained beyond endurance, but were saved from being overwhelmed by the worst. We recall how often things have turned out better for us than we feared. Such memories of God's saving love at work in our experience should prevent us from being intimidated by the future and surmising that we have been abandoned to the devastating force of the atomic bomb. Does not the past reassure us that whenever a deadly weapon is devised something new is soon discovered to counteract it and perhaps to cancel its effect? Nothing ever turns out so annihilating as was

predicted, because the best brains quickly set to work to guard against it for the sake of humanity. No human mind can produce anything which other human minds cannot learn to resist, and possibly annul. It is the nature of things—that is to say, God's will—that no destructive invention and no powerful State are ever allowed to be almighty and usurp His throne. According to Coventry Patmore, 'listeners at the doors of destiny' can discern

> The fly-wheel swift and still
> Of God's incessant will

preventing the contemporary menace from becoming omnipotent and limiting the amount of harm it can do. God reigns, and He cannot be deposed. His merciful sovereignty keeps evil within bounds, and provides for the survival and development of all, as a father does for his family. His love is universal and makes 'his sun to shine on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust,' to give them an opportunity to live and do better. That is why the irresponsible and the unworthy have many fortunate escapes and often get off more lightly than they deserve. Because they are treated, not according to their merit but according to God's mercy, they may presume that they do not need to worry about their sins but can bear up and hope for the best.

'God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able'—yes, faithful even to the faithless as a redeeming example, a rebuke and a recall which should put their faithlessness to shame. But do not misunderstand the Apostle's statement as a cheery generalization that everything will come right and work out for the best even for those who discount God as the authority on how they should behave. People may be so heedless of the danger-signals He has put up in their conscience that their runaway spirit is surprised and ambushed by the false promises of evil, caught and overpowered in the traps of sin. They may so evade His loyal guardianship as to be tempted more than they are able to bear and blinded and enslaved by lusts too strong for them. They have forfeited the right to bear up and hope for the best, because they have put themselves into the fatal clutches of the worst.

Yet the God of love cannot bear them to remain in an unbearable plight. He does not desert those who have deserted Him, does not leave them in the lurch but follows them up with His persuasion, recall and offer of forgiveness, searches them out, stabs their conscience broad awake and beckons them home in Christ. That is how Divine mercy moves the sinful heart to repentance and enables it to extricate itself from galling entanglements. God is always faithful and helps people out of the wicked ways which they are finding intolerable. That is how the sins of the old year can be left behind, and those who have gone wrong can make good, can bear up and hope for the best.

Now some would deny that there is any such faithful ally and promoter of the attempt to make a come-back from evil. They contend that the repentant spirit is sometimes baffled by a malicious chance, a mocking fate which makes the best intentions null and void, and bad luck seems to have the last word. In *The Secret Woman*, Eden Phillpotts describes how the blizzard of events is too much for an erring husband and his wronged wife and prevents them from being reconciled. The storm is roaring outside, and the noise of the wind and rain on the window panes drowns the sound of the woman's voice when she offers him forgiveness, but she assumes her husband has heard her pleadings without making any response and her heart hardens against him. Later she meets him beside the deep farm well, but the din of the gale makes his penitent words inaudible and the rain blinds her to the tears in his eyes. All she hears is that he is whistling, as is his habit in moments of agitation, and the whistling so provokes her that she strikes him, the unexpected blow throws him off his balance, and he falls over down the deep well to his death. Thus chance is alleged to play the mischief with good purposes and bring them to a dead stop. But it is a distorted view to conclude that the repentant spirit is helpless in the grip of disordered circumstances instead of being helped forward by a Fatherly Providence. Our Lord taught that God is like a father who runs to meet the returning prodigal, anxious lest he should be overcome or fall out in the last lap before he reached his father's doorstep, and leaps to welcome his limping approach lest he should be spent ere he arrived. 'God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able.' If you resolve to redress some injustice, disloyalty, neglect before the new year comes and make a clean start again, you can rest assured that you will not be crushed by any cruel irony of events but that the God you trust will bear you up and carry you through, so that you can hope for the best.

But mark this. St. Paul does not generalize that all will be well with Tom, Dick, and Harry. What he vouches for is that believing hearts, committed to Christian standards of living, will not be too severely tested or called upon to bear and dare too much. His promise is that lives surrendered to Christ will be protected from any final moral débacle. They will discover that God does not take more out of people than He puts into them, but stands by them and strengthens them in every tight corner, because His succour is even

greater than His demand. This is the Apostle's verdict on the favourable prospects of the life pledged to God in Christ, and his verdict should carry special weight with us, because it is the verdict not of a spectator but of a sufferer who has had a gruelling time and who can speak from personal experience. He should know, if anyone does. Shocks, ordeals and escapes he has had in plenty, and yet he can say that life has never hit him too hard for him to stand, and has never been too big a drain upon his energies, because he is aware of being kept up and kept going by God. That is how he bears up and hopes for the best, and it is a moral tonic for us as the old year ends and the new year begins. St. Paul speaks as a fighting spirit, who has discovered that he is so Divinely accompanied and armed that he need not be beaten by anything that happens to him but can win through against brutal surprises and grim tensions to the victory which God has prepared for those who love Him. He declares that no man who sticks to his faith can ever be so overwhelmed by evil forces as to feel the battle is over and he must capitulate, because God helps him through and helps him out. The Apostle thus wrote to the Corinthian Christians how trustworthy God had proved Himself to be, and Newman wrote to his nephew in a similar vein: 'For myself, now at the end of a long life, I say from a free heart that God has never failed me, never disappointed me, has ever turned evil into good for me. And what He has been to me, who have deserved His love so little, such will He be, I believe and know, to anyone who will not repel Him, or turn from His pleading.' 'God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able.'

St. Paul grasped the vigilant sufficiency of God for his most desperate needs by self-commitment to Christ. In touch with Christ he discovered how reliable, how appropriate, and how loving God is in His care for us. In contact with Christ we, too, can find that this is the lesson of life, as Wordsworth put it.

> That the procession of our fate, howe'er
> Sad or disturbed, is ordered by a Being
> Of infinite benevolence and power;
> Whose everlasting purposes embrace
> All accidents, converting them to good.

This is a great comfort, which steadies and rallies us in the bad patches of experience, as we pass from one year to another. We can bear up and hope for the best, because we have this certainty, that we shall be upheld by the unremitting guardianship of God. Be quite sure of that before you start the new year. 'God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able.'

First Sunday after Epiphany.

Human Blindness.

By the Reverend Professor Norman H. Snaith, D.D., Wesley College, Leeds.

'And the Lord opened the eyes of the young man; and he saw.'—2 K 6^{17}.

He had not really been blind before, because he could see the Syrian armies on every side. His trouble was that that was all he could see. Do you remember Mr. Pickwick's young man giving evidence at the trial? Sam Weller said that he could not see through a flight of stairs and a deal door, because he had 'only eyes' and his 'wision' was limited. It was the same with Elisha's young man. He had only eyes, and his 'wision' was limited. He could not see what Elisha could see—the chariotry of the Lord, chariots and horses of fire encircling the mountain between the prophet and the foe. He had eyes, but not the kind of eyes with which he could see that sort of thing.

Or consider those radio programmes which go out on a beam to Australia. I suppose they cross the forests of the foot-hills of the northern Andes. Up in the head-waters of the Amazon tributaries there are dozens of Indian tribes who have probably never seen a white man. Those radio programmes are passing over them, are all round about them, but they never hear. They do not know, and it all goes past them—symphonies, concertos, hot music, talks, sermons, music-hall, and the rest. They have ears, but not the kind of ears with which they can hear that sort of thing.

Let us get back to Elisha and his young man on that hill in Dothan. Suppose that, the day before all this happened, Elisha had told his young man about the chariotry of the Lord, that it is possible to see the vision of the sure safety which God can provide, I wonder what the young man would have replied? If he was at all normal he would have said, 'Stuff and nonsense,' or 'Oh, yeah,' or whatever it was that enlightened young men of that day would say. One thing is certain; he would never have believed such a story. Why? Because his common sense would have told him that the whole yarn was rubbish, for common sense is our judgment based upon our own past experience. The same sort of thing would be true of the South American Indian. How could he believe? Perhaps not even hearing would convince him, for such a thing would be wholly foreign to his experience.

This applies to all experience, but especially to religious experience. There are thousands of folk in this country who have not the slightest interest in religion. It is not enough to say that they are indifferent, and to leave it at that. For

one thing, we talk a different language, and words like Faith and Grace which mean so much to us, mean nothing at all to them. That can, of course, be remedied in part, and it is the duty of all preachers and teachers to seek by every endeavour to use words which are readily intelligible. But even though we use the common words of ordinary speech, the gulf is not thereby bridged. Some years ago I was walking along a street in Leeds and I passed an open door, flush on the pavement. As I passed one way a young woman passed the other way. We crossed exactly opposite the door. The radio set was on full blast, and the sound of the music came out loudly through the door. She shrugged her shoulders and said, 'Oh, that rubbish.' It was the opening of the first movement of Beethoven's Violin Concerto. And she said it was rubbish. I admit that if there had been rather less volume, it would have sounded better, but she said that the Violin Concerto was rubbish. I do not suppose that even Beethoven wrote two better tunes than the two main tunes in that only Violin Concerto he ever composed. If it had been jazz, I might have said it was rubbish. I have no ear for jazz. She had no ear for Beethoven.

Same music, different ears. But no; not exactly different ears. The difference was inside. I had been taught how to listen to Beethoven, and to appreciate his work, though in an amateurish sort of way. And I have taken pains to listen to him at every opportunity. The result is that there is a small Beethoven cell inside, and that is why on that particular occasion I heard what the young woman could not hear. She had no room for Beethoven. These people who have no interest in religion are quite right when they explain it on the ground that they 'have no room for that sort of thing.' They have never made any room. They have never realized that they had any need to make any room. They do not know that it is possible for a man to walk, albeit humbly, with God, that a man can be more conscious of the Presence of God than of the presence of his next-door neighbour. This all is another world; it comprises a whole new set of experiences. They have eyes, but not the eyes with which to see God. They have ears, but not the ears with which to hear His Voice.

How can they hear without a preacher? That can be remedied. If they will not come to us, then we must go to them.

How can they hear without a preacher who uses words they can understand? That, too, can be remedied. It comes by earnest prayer, by solid thinking, and by a sound knowledge both of doctrine and of men.

How can they hear without ears? That can be remedied, but only by growing new ears, ears that can hear His Voice, calling always, all round about them, though they, like the Indian, are deaf to it. And it means new eyes, eyes that can see God, though, like the young man on the hill in Dothan, they are blind from seeing Him.

This much is certain. No man will or can grow new ears and eyes as long as he is satisfied with the ears and eyes he already has. And, further, as long as he thinks his disability is of a minor character, he will seek by every means to improve the ears and eyes he already has. We, God forgive us, have been in time past more than ready to provide for him a multiplicity of spectacles and deaf-aids—social evenings, musical societies, dramatic societies, social gospel, and a hundred and one things. But these things do not grow new ears; they merely make them bigger and longer. If a man is ever to grow new ears and new eyes, he must first come fully and definitely to the conclusion that otherwise he is going to be both deaf and blind. He must know his desperate need. That was what brought Elisha's young man to the point when his eyes could be opened to see the vision of God. It was so with the Philippian jailor. He had to come to the realization that he had done everything he himself could possibly do, and that if somebody else did not do something for him, he was doomed. It was so also with John Wesley. The turning point in his religious experience was his fear of death. That is plain from his *Journal*, and it appears twice—once during the story of the voyage to Georgia (February 1736) and again on his return to London (January 1738). He was afraid to die, and he was rightly sure that if he really believed in God he would know peace and calm in his own heart even in that last extremity.

But in each case there was another factor. Close beside Elisha's young man there stood Elisha, and Elisha could see. In the darkness, but within the jailor's hearing, there was Paul, whom no peril of death could ever scare. He had seen 'a light from heaven, above the brightness of the sun,' and he had 'heard unspeakable words.' John Wesley met Christians who were not afraid to die; on board ship, the Moravians; in London, Peter Böhler.

On the human side, therefore, there are two essential factors. Men must first realize their desperate need. Secondly, they must see a man who has found the answer to that need. They must realize that they are sinners, and they must see a saint. These two factors are essential, but they are not sufficient, for the real change is the work of the Holy Spirit. He alone can give to men new ears and new eyes, because these new ears and eyes must grow from within, from that new heart, that changed heart by which alone a

man can be aware of the Presence of the Living God.

The conclusion of the matter for you and for me is this. We, preachers and non-preachers, but all equally Christians, must realize our own desperate need, and must, by the Grace of God, have found the answer to that need in our own perience. We must then, by every means which e Holy Spirit will make clear to us, persuade n of their desperate need, and of the full answer that desperate need, an answer which, please d, shall be evident not only in what we say, t even more in what men plainly see us to be. t is not true that men have endless time. 'The bridegroom came; and they that were ready went n with him to the marriage feast: and the door was shut.' The greatest crime is to say, 'Peace, peace, when there is no peace.' This is to 'heal the hurt of my people lightly.' To talk of endless chances beyond the grave, to urge men to further good works in order that thus they may make themselves good enough, or to comfort them by saying that their present good works are good enough—these sayings, and others like them, are the modern equivalents of the very things against which prophets and apostles have thundered. The time is now, lest the day come when it will be never.

Every man is standing upon a hill in Dothan, and every man is ringed around with the enemies of his soul. For each man there are the enemies without, and the enemy within. Most of us are doubly blind, blind to our desperate need, blinder still to its answer. Lord, open *my* eyes, that *I* may see.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

Glorious Bonds.

BY THE REVEREND ROBERT BROWN, B.A., B.D., LEICESTER.

'Remember my bonds.'—Col 4[18].

Have you ever been disappointed with yourself, imagined yourself something of a failure and felt that if you had had another kind of education perhaps, or different work, you might have made more of life? So many discouragements, so many difficulties, you had well-nigh given way to despair. If that is your mood, then look at this man, and take courage! This letter was written from prison to a church founded by a disciple of Paul, Epaphras, who had lately come to Rome with mixed news of the state of religion in Colossæ. Some new teachers had arisen giving out what they vainly imagined was a better form of the Christian religion, more in accordance, they would say, with the spirit of the times. It was a mixture of Paganism, Judaism, and Christianity; and in view of this false teaching Epaphras and Paul are alike concerned for the purity of the Faith. So the Apostle in this letter goes to the heart of things by stressing the uniqueness of the gospel and the supremacy of Christ. The letter was dictated, as was Paul's custom, to an amanuensis, but as a guarantee of its genuineness (for others had purported to teach in his name) he signs the letter and adds the final salutation or blessing in his own hand. And as he writes he notices the difference between the neat, skilled handwriting of the amanuensis and his own. In another letter, to the Galatians, he had written, half-playfully, 'See with how large letters I have written unto you,' so perhaps here too the writing was large and scrawly, maybe indistinct, and as he looks at the writing and then at his hand impeded by a chain, he slips in a word—'Remember my bonds.' But we shall misunderstand him if we imagine he is whimpering about life. There is something of dignity, almost of pride, in the phrase. He is no prisoner of Cæsar's, he is, as he was to write to the Philippians, 'a prisoner of the Lord.' Remember his bonds—for his very bonds were a guarantee that he was a genuine follower of Christ and that what he had written was the authentic Christian message. There is none of that littleness of character which we sometimes meet with in life, which would make self a martyr. The word 'remember' has reference to prayer. He is in effect saying, 'Remember my bonds in your prayers. Pray that they may be broken, or used of God to His glory.' Have you ever stopped to think what bonds this man knew—what bonds were broken by the power of Christ, what bonds he had to endure for Christ, what bonds were used to the glory of Christ and the extension of His Kingdom?

1. *There are bonds that have to be broken.* These are the bonds which bind a man to his lowest animal nature. 'The good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do . . . who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord.' That is a piece of spiritual autobiography. And as we read those words they strike a responsive chord in our own hearts; to-day, as yesterday,

> He breaks the power of cancelled sin,
> He sets the prisoner free.

There are bonds in life that a man should break, or they will break him. Let us remember in prayer those bonds, that we may gain the power to break and have done with them.

2. *There are bonds that have to be endured.* Walk down the wards of any large hospital and you will see human courage and endurance that will put

you to shame. But it is not only the physical bonds that are endured to the enriching of character. There can be pain of mind and heart which can be as bondage to the spirit of man. I have known men who might have been in bondage to their sorrows and their disappointments and perchance their failures; and instead they have found grace sufficient to endure what must be endured in life, without whimpering and without complaint. Some have called this quality 'fortitude,' and as John Buchan wrote in his *Mr. Standfast*, 'the head man at the job was the Apostle Paul.' St. Paul writes with 'large letters,' perhaps an indication of bad sight. Samuel Pepys had to lay down his pen, not being able to write his journal any longer because of the pain in his eyes caused through some kind of astigmatism. Then there was that mysterious physical ailment, perhaps recurrent malaria, which St. Paul refers to as 'the thorn in the flesh' and which he besought that Christ would remove, only to receive the assurance, 'my grace is sufficient for thee.' He had to learn to endure those bonds.

3. *There are bonds to be triumphed over.* The Apostle was evidently of an unprepossessing appearance. 'Look at him,' men might have cried in derision, 'that ugly little Jew.' He was perhaps in some way physically deformed. But when he began to speak, when the fire of the love of Christ lit up his countenance and his keen, rapier-like intellect gave thrust for thrust, there was no derision then. Even his enemies had to acknowledge him a force to be reckoned with, either feared or respected.

Demosthenes, the greatest orator of the Greeks, had to triumph over the bondage of a stammering tongue; Franklin Delano Roosevelt, one of the greatest Presidents America has ever known, had to endure and surmount physical infirmity—these, the heroes of living, burst their bonds of circumstance, and did we but know it, their numbers are legion. Never forget the hero within the common man. Never despise the hero in your own breast. There are bonds in your life you, too, can triumph over.

4. *There are bonds that a man should treasure.* These are the bonds that bind him to Christ. Bonds of conscience which will not allow the good man to live at lower levels than his best. Bonds that, being endured, have become means of grace.

Can you see him in his Roman prison? Follow the line of the chain from the wrist of Paul to that of the Roman soldier. He, too, was bound for a space to this prisoner. Before many months are out there were Christians in the Prætorian Guard and saints in Cæsar's household.

He, who had dreamed of coming to Rome an ambassador on behalf of Christ his King, had come an ambassador indeed, but an ambassador in chains. But the very chains were the means of his message penetrating to the heart of the empire and of extending throughout its length and breadth. How they marched, those Roman soldiers. Yes, and how in their marching they could take a message, for ideas as well as legions travelled those Roman roads. And the Word of God was not bound!

Then again had he not been bound where would this restless missionary have wandered and to what tasks would he have set his hand? In such labours abundant what leisure would he have had for constructive thought. Letters from prison—there might have been no letters but for those bonds. Here in these pages we have the product of one of the most acute Christian minds of the centuries; and it might all never have been but for those bonds.

Perchance there are some among us who imagine they are bound by circumstance. Bonds! But are you sure they are not the bonds that God would bind? 'Man, I am bound to that office desk, what chance have I of serving God?' Bound to a desk! Are you sure it is not the bond of God? What if God wants a 'man of God,' just there, at that desk, in that office, dealing with the folk you have to deal with and doing the work you have to do? 'Remember my bonds.' What are you doing with your bonds? What matters is not so much what they bind us from, as what they bind us to. Are they the bonds of sin, to be broken, or are they the bonds of Christ, to be 'remembered' indeed that they might be used according to His purpose and the extension of His Kingdom.

So I would not only have you look at this man and his bonds, and go forth into life with new faith and new courage; I would have you go forth with a prayer in your heart—a prayer every man and woman can pray: 'Lord, remember *my* bonds.' For when a man lifts his bonds to the throne of God he is on the way to triumph in life. The chains will either drop from his wrists or they will be burdens no longer; touched by the love of Christ they will be transformed like unto the bonds of St. Paul.

SEPTUAGESIMA.

The Call to Endurance.

BY THE REVEREND STEWART MECHIE, M.A., EDINBURGH.

'Thou therefore endure hardness, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ.'—2 Ti 2^3.

'Let those who wish to continue the war against the stranger come with me. I offer neither pay nor quarters nor provisions. I offer hunger, thirst,

forced marches, battles and death.' Such was Garibaldi's appeal to his men when the defence of Rome had proved fruitless; and such is the spirit of the aged Paul's appeal to Timothy, his favourite son in the faith. 'Endure hardness,' he says, or, as the compound form of the verb in the Greek suggests, 'Take your share of hardness,' or as Dr. Moffatt puts it, 'Join the ranks of those who bear suffering, like a loyal soldier of Christ Jesus.'

Timothy was not naturally a strong character, and he was still a young man to have a position of responsible oversight. The difficulties involved in his supervision of churches were manifold, what with the loss of zeal on the part of second-generation Christians, the emergence of dangerous heresy, and the grave prospect of persecution looming ahead. It would have been easy for St. Paul to send him a message couched in terms of a facile optimism. 'Don't worry! Things will all come right soon.' That is too often the line we take with friends in trouble, hoping thus to help them to keep steadfast till circumstances become more favourable. It is a dangerous line; for, if circumstances do not in fact improve, it only leaves the person concerned more depressed than ever. Possibly St. Paul had reason to know that things would be worse for Timothy before they were better. At any rate, he gives Timothy no word of facile optimism; nor, on the other hand, does he send him a message of weakening sympathy. 'I'm sorry for you. I really don't know what things are coming to and what we can do.' That is another line that we are tempted to take when troubles abound. Yet it, too, is unwise, for it tends to breed that very dangerous thing, self-pity. Indeed, it is often the product of self-pity in the would-be sympathizer. Like the cat who does not caress you but caresses itself against you, the sympathizer may be not so much sympathizing with you as sympathizing with himself against you. No! Paul is wiser far. Not facile optimism nor weakening sympathy is his line, but heroic challenge in a call to endure. 'Take your share of hardness,' he cries; and one recalls that a greater than he had said, 'Take up the cross.' Heroic challenge is surely the line of appeal to the young soldier of Christ, for, as Carlyle put it, not by flattering our appetites; no, by awakening the heroic that slumbers in every heart, can any religion gain followers.'

This world imposes stern conditions on human life, and it is unlikely that any man can live long without having to endure hardness. Some, indeed, may try to avoid it, and if they are unscrupulous enough to take the line of least resistance, always to drift with the current and turn their backs to the wind, they may largely succeed. That way, however, is not open to the loyal soldier of Jesus Christ. The Christian life involves hardship and must be accepted on that condition. In that connexion it is significant that the term St. Paul uses here, 'soldier of Christ,' became in the second century almost the equivalent of 'Christian.' The idea implied is that the Son of God is at war with the forces of darkness and Christians are those who have rallied to His side and, in the words of the Guild Hymn by Dr. Charteris, are claiming on 'the embattled field the victory Christ has given.' In this passage the object of the warfare and the enemy encountered are in the background. What is stressed is the discipline imposed on the Christian. He must be ready, like a good soldier in the fighting line, to neglect all else but his immediate duties and in fulfilling them to be ready to endure every hardship. Hence the challenge to heroism in the call to endurance—'Take your share of hardness.' With such a Saviour and Captain of salvation the Christian cannot honourably escape struggle and suffering; but what he can confidently expect is that along with a share in the present hardness he may, amid 'misfortunes great and sma',' have, in the words of Burns, 'aye a heart aboon them a',' and in the end have a share in his Captain's final triumph.

For, notice well, the Christian is not alone in his enduring of hardness. 'Take your share of hardness,' says the Apostle. Who, then, takes the other shares? Paul himself had done so: all Christians are called to do so. That is one of the things for which the Church exists—just to be such a fellowship that in it the strong can help the weak, taking more than the share that would be theirs according to the world's standards, and fulfil the law of Christ by bearing one another's burdens. Perhaps there is more in this idea of sharing than we commonly suppose. We are not isolated units, we are members of the body of Christ, deeply and intimately connected with one another in Him. Perhaps in enduring our share of the hardness of the Christian life we are helping others more than we think. In a letter to his niece Gwen, von Hügel writes: 'I wonder whether you realize a deep great fact? That souls—all human souls—are deeply interconnected? That, I mean, we can not only pray for each other, but suffer for each other? That these long, trying wakings, that I was able to offer them to God and to Christ for my Gwen-child that He might ever strengthen, sweeten, steady her in her true, simple, humble love and dependence upon Him? Nothing is more real than this interconnexion—this gracious power put by God Himself into the very heart of our infirmities.' Yes, others can endure hardness with us and we with them. We can all take our share, and it is not for any of us

to murmur and question if our share should seem to us too great as compared with that of others. Surely the Captain who assigns to everyone his post in the fight knows what may be demanded of us—all the more so, indeed, as He has promised to share with us all.

Here surely is a thought to make the heart leap as we respond to the call to endurance. The good soldiers of Jesus Christ are not alone as they take their share of hardness. The Captain is with them, and sometimes they know it, not only because they trust His promise but also because they feel Him near. When John G. Paton stood beside that lonely grave in the South Sea Islands, and when he with his own hands made his wife's coffin and with his own hands dug her grave, the savages were looking on. They had never seen it in this fashion. Here is Paton's testimony. 'If it had not been for Jesus and the Presence that He vouchsafed me, I would have gone mad and died beside that lonely grave.'

Let us picture the call to endure in terms of an incident related by Dr. Hubert Simpson. He tells of a bricklayer who was an ambulance man in the First World War. One of the first things he did on demobilization was to ask the Foreign Mission collector to call and to promise her a substantial quarterly contribution. He told her how he had carried a wounded Indian soldier to hospital and the blood of the Indian got on his hands. It struck him then how strange it was that a dark man should come half round the world to toil and suffer and share in a white man's conflict. As he thought of that and of all that it implied of solidarity in suffering he had a vision of the Cross and on the Cross a black Christ dying for the sins of the whole world. There you have a profound image of the facts behind the call to take your share of hardness—the bricklayer, the Indian, and the Christ all bound in the bundle of life together. Let us free that image from all accidental and temporary features and face this truth that all Christians, weaker and stronger, and the Son of God Himself, in their different ways and in their different measures, are standing in the ranks of those who endure hardness for the Kingdom of God's sake. Yes, each for all and all for each and Christ in and for all.

Take your share of hardness, then, remembering that Christian hardness is not in vain, for the Crucified, Victorious, and Exalted Christ is in it, and, as Paul goes on to say, 'if we be dead with him, we shall also live with him: If we suffer, we shall also reign with him.'

Contributions and Comments.

Was His Father Lying Dead at Home?

WHILST deeply appreciative of the article in the August number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (lxi. 350) and the trouble which your contributor, the Rev. H. G. Howard, Urun-Islampur, India, has taken in order to confirm his exegesis on Lk $9^{59f.}$, I found that the contribution, although detailed with newer facts, was by no means a completely new interpretation. I recalled that I had read this commentary by David Smith, *The Days of His Flesh*. I quote *op. cit.*, 91: 'It seems as though the behaviour of Jesus in this instance fully matched the arrogance and inhumanity of the Rabbis; but a little consideration places it in another light and reveals the disciple's plea as a palpable evasion. . . . But in fact his father cannot have been dead; he cannot even have been dying. Immediate interment is necessary in the sultry East; and, had his father been either dead or dying, the disciple should have been at home performing the funeral rites or closing the dying eyes; . . . He craved a truce from following Jesus that he might tend his father in his declining years, employing a phrase which is common to this day in the unchanging East. It is told that, when a youth was counselled by a Syrian missionary to complete his education by travelling in Europe, he answered: "I must first bury my father." His father was in excellent health, and the youth meant merely that domestic duties had a prior claim.'

W. J. DAVIES.

Tredegar, Monmouth.

THE Rev. H. G. Howard's note on Mt 8^{21}, Lk 9^{59} recalls the following from Wendt's *The Teaching of Jesus*, ii. 70, note: 'A missionary in Syria, M. Waldmeier, relates that an intelligent and rich young Turk, whom he had advised at the close of his education to make a tour to Europe, had answered, "I must first of all bury my father."' The father was alive and well.

Also here in Ireland, where quite often in our country farm-houses father or mother lives with a married son or daughter, it is customary to speak of 'the old man,' or 'the old woman' without a shade of disrespect.

C. S. S. ELLISON.

Sandycove, Co. Dublin.

Job xiii. 9–11 : A New Interpretation.

THE Poem of Job is a dramatic composition independent of the folk-tale of which only the beginning (chs. 1–2) and the end (ch. 13^{7-17}) have been preserved in the Book of Job. The poem begins in ch. 3 with a violent attack by Job upon God's treatment of suffering men, with special reference to his own sufferings. In the writer's Schweich Lectures (published in 1947) it has been argued at length that the essential theme of the following debate between Job and his three comforters is the truth or falsehood of Job's bitter charges against God and not his own claim to virtue, which the friends do not deny. The interpretation of ch. 22 as an attack on Job's character is inconsistent with the friends' steady recognition elsewhere of the unblemished goodness of Job's past life. The finely phrased utterance of Eliphaz in ch. 22 is not addressed to Job in particular but to mankind in general. It proclaims the principles that inspire God's government of the world of men. Job's own fourth speech, of which 13^{9-11} is a part, illustrates the real nature of the controversy between Job and his friends.

Towards the beginning of this speech Job asserts that God is responsible (12^{9}) for the notorious prosperity of godless men (12^{4-6}), for recurring disastrous weather conditions (12^{15}) and for the many other calamities of men and nations (12^{16-25}). The comforters, who deny the truth of these charges, are themselves guilty of untruth ($13^{1ff.}$). They speak of God (or, 'on behalf of God') untruly' (13^{7}). Clearly what Job asserts and what the friends deny is that God is often malevolent and unjustly bestows His benefits on notable evildoers ($12^{5f.}$). Job's charges lead up to 13^{9-11} and decide their meaning and implications.

In 13^{9-11} Job raises and answers the question of God's presumable attitude to the subject in debate. What would God's verdict be, if He intervened? It would be for Job against his friends, in other words, against God's own defenders and for His impassioned accuser! Incredible, it may be thought. Yet surely the verdict so interpreted is an appropriately renewed expression of the truth for which Job contends throughout the poem and is a paradoxical reassertion of that truth by God Himself. It is assumed that God does act in the way that Job had always maintained and that He will not deny His manifest habitual practices. The lines provide an effective climax to the first half of Job's fourth speech, before he turns with increased directness to resume his debate with God.

Expositors generally find in the verses here analysed a solitary expression of Job's confidence that God will acquit him of wrongdoing and will vindicate him against the supposed false charges of his friends. This interpretation ignores the evidence regarding the nature of the friends' controversy with Job, lying immediately to hand in the preceding verses. In the writer's discussion of 13^{1-12} in his Schweich Lectures (p. 47) the current interpretation was rejected, but the precise application and full significance of God's condemnation of the friends was not understood. God's verdict is not a pronouncement on the controversy between Job and God, which would involve a decision regarding the personal merits and fortunes of Job. It pronounces rather on the controversy between Job and his friends and so decides regarding God's alleged misgovernment of the world. By one all-inclusive Divine judgment the friends are confuted, Job's charges against the Almighty are established and the miseries of human life are irrefutably derived from their ultimate cause in the Divine will.

WILLIAM B. STEVENSON.

Edinburgh.

Recent Foreign Theology.

The Unity of Authorship of Luke and Acts. Two issues of the Swiss series of studies in German which have frequently been mentioned in these columns are devoted to a dissertation by Dr. R. Morgenthaler on the form and content of the art of Luke as a witness to the unity of authorship of the Third Gospel and the Acts.[1] The first volume is a close study of the words, sentences, and sections of the two books, and of the books as a whole, designed to bring out the parallelism that marked the author alike in both works, and that is seen in the twofold nature of his composition. It is characteristic for terms and incidents to run in pairs, and many of his sentences show a balance of form that reminds us of the *parallelismus membrorum* of Old Testament poetry. The second volume is devoted to a study of the content and historical value of the two books. Luke is presented not so much as a recorder of facts as an

[1] *Die lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis: Gestalt und Gehalt der Kunst des Lukas*, 2 vols. (*Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, xiv. and xv.) [1949]. Zwingli Verlag, Zürich; Swiss fr. 10.80 and 7.50.

artist who employed his materials with a skill and a technique which derived from himself and which sets its stamp on every part of his work. Altogether this is an acute and commendable study, bringing new and valuable support for the view of the common authorship of the books.

Swiss Protestant History. From the same press three volumes of a recently started series of studies in the history of Swiss Protestantism have appeared. Of these one is by Dr. Ernst Ramp and is devoted to the problem of usury.[1] After a rapid survey of the problem to the time of the Reformation the author examines the treatment of the question by Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli, and, in a short concluding chapter, in the Roman Catholic Church since the Reformation. The second study is of the Christian Sabbath, and is by Fräulein Dr. H. Stokar.[2] Here again there is a brief opening review of the supersession of the Jewish Sabbath by the first day of the week, and the transformation of its motive, followed by a more detailed study of the question in the Middle Ages and in the Reformation period, and particularly in Zürich. The third volume is by Dr. A. Rich, and is devoted to the beginnings of Zwingli's theology.[3] Here in particular Zwingli's relations with Luther and Erasmus are studied, in an independent work that brings an original contribution to the subject. Indeed the publishers claim that it will form a landmark in Zwinglian studies. Of the three volumes the last is likely to find more readers in this country, and is the most important, though all are of interest to the Church historian of the Reformation period.

The Third Chapter of Luke. The Swedish scholar, Dr. H. Sahlin, whose study of the first two chapters of Luke [4] has already been noted in these columns,[5] has now continued his work with an elaborate examination of the third chapter of this Gospel.[6] Like the previous work this is governed by a theory of a Proto-Luke (different from Streeter's), which was written in Hebrew down to Lk 3^{7a}, and thereafter in Aramaic. Here Dr. Sahlin offers us his translation of what he believes to have stood in Proto-Luke, and then gives a detailed discussion of the text and presents his reasons for regarding parts of the present text as additions to the original text. In accordance with his general theory he sometimes reconstructs a Hebrew 'original' in the first seven verses, and an Aramaic 'original' thereafter. He has a valuable chapter on the meaning of the Baptism of Jesus according to Proto-Luke and one on John's baptism, Jewish proselyte baptism and Christian baptism, with an excursus on the meaning of the verb *βαπτίζειν*. An Appendix offers a defence of his theory. Much learning has gone into this work, and even readers who are not always convinced by the excisions will find much acute and valuable comment.

Dutch Oriental Studies. A volume of Oriental Studies has been published by the Netherlands' Oriental Society to mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of its foundation.[7] That anniversary fell in May 1945, and it is not, therefore, surprising that the volume did not appear on that date, but was, indeed, delayed for more than three years. The volume includes thirty-five essays on Egyptian, Coptic, Accadian, Biblical, Islamic, Indian, and Far Eastern subjects. More than half of the articles are written in English, and other articles are written in French and German, while the few remaining articles, which are written in Dutch, are all followed by a summary in English, French, or Latin. Only a few of the articles, of interest to the Biblical student, can here be mentioned. P. van der Meer discusses the date of the reign of Menes, whose accession he dates 2400 B.C.—a thousand years later than Breasted's date, and more than two thousand years later than some have held. In the course of his paper he deals with the date of Hammurabi, whose date has been so much discussed in recent years.[8] W. H. Gispen writes on 'Azazel' and while rejecting the treatment of the word as translatable in the Greek and Vulgate versions, followed by some modern versions, is unable to throw any light on the nature of the old heathen deity or demon whose name this is. P. A. H. de Boer discusses the status of a Hebrew woman slave on the basis of Ex 20^{7-11}, and the rights which she enjoyed. Th. C. Vriezen shows that the composition of the Books of Samuel is more complex than some have

[1] *Das Zinsproblem: eine historische Untersuchung* (*Quellen und Abhandlungen zur Geschichte des schweizerischen Protestantismus*, vol. iv.) [1949]. Zwingli Verlag, Zürich; Swiss Fr. 7.

[2] *Sonntagsgesetzgebung: ein Überblick bis in die Gegenwart.* (Same series, vol. v.) [1949]. Swiss Fr. 6.50.

[3] *Die Anfänge der Theologie Huldrych Zwinglis.* (Same series, vol. vi.) [1949]. Swiss Fr. 9.80.

[4] *Der Messias und das Gottesvolk.*

[5] Cf. THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lviii. [April 1947], 194.

[6] *Studien zum dritten Kapitel des Lukasevangeliums* (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, 1949: 2) [1949]. Lundequistska, Uppsala, and Harrassowitz, Leipzig. Kr. 6.

[7] *Orientalia Neerlandica* [1948]. A. W. Sijthoff Leiden. Fl. 15.00.

[8] For a fuller study by the same author, cf. *The Ancient Chronology of Western Asia and Egypt* [1947] Brill, Leiden.

upposed. He begins from the Document of 2 S 1(10)–20, 1 K 1, 2, and works back to 1 S 1–16, where he finds four sources employed, of which one is to be connected with that Document. J. Simons studies the structure and interpretation of Jos 16–17, whose problems arise from the fact that the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh are viewed in two ways—as a single block and as separate tribes. J. Schoneveld presents a new theory on Urim and Thummim. He rejects the derivation of Urim from אור, but connects it with אש = *light*, and holds that they were not for use together, but that Urim were consulted when information about future happenings was wanted, and Thummim in judiciary cases. He is therefore compelled to deny the value of the longer LXX text of 1 S 14^{41}, which most scholars regard as one of the outstanding examples of its importance. All of the essays are full of interest, but these are the principal ones bearing on Biblical scholarship.

Ebionitism. A learned and important work on *The Theology and History of Jewish Christianity* has appeared from the pen of H. J. Schoeps.[1] It is also a voluminous work—much too voluminous to receive adequate notice here. The author briefly reviews earlier studies of the subject, and then turns to the available sources which he surveys at length. From this he passes to the theology of the Ebionites—their Adoptionist Christology, their Chiliasm, their attitude to the Law and to the cultus—and finally to a survey of their history so far as it can be recovered. Throughout his work bears marks of profound study, and claims attention from the New Testament scholar and the Church historian, while non-specialist readers will find large stores of knowledge collected for them, far richer and more detailed than the meagre account contained in the ordinary handbooks. The study of Ebionite theories on the Old Testament, its interpolation and its interpretation, is of value to the Old Testament scholar, though not as an example of scientific criticism. There are sections on the place of Ebionitism in Judaism and in Christian history, on Gnostic Ebionitism, and on Ebionite elements in Islam. At the end of the book a hundred and forty pages are devoted to excursuses. These deal with a variety of special points, including the question whether the Epistle of James is an Ebionite document as some have supposed—a question which the author answers in the negative, holding that the author of the Epistle was a Jew but not an Ebionite; several studies on Symmachus and his translation of the Old Testament, including a study of the traces of Ebionitism in the rendering; and a long excursus on the question of an Ebionite Acts of the Apostles. The full bibliography shows the wide acquaintance of the author with Jewish, patristic and modern works, and the use made of these in the body of the book bears eloquent testimony to the intimacy of his knowledge of them. This work will take its place at once as a standard work, and it is unlikely to be superseded for a long time.

H. H. Rowley.

Manchester University.

[1] *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums* [1949]. Mohr, Tübingen; DM 27—in paper; 31—in cloth.

Entre Nous.

A Christmas Message.[1]

Late at night I sat, pondering the imponderable mystery of the Divine Incarnation. I dreamed a dream—of two places, and of two persons. The first place was S——, near T——, inside the great Hindu temple which dominates the whole town. It was *puja* hour, and in the dusk, with twinkling lights, the odour of incense and of burning camphor, the tinkling of little bells and the clanging of great ones, the evening 'sacrifice' was being offered by the elderly priest, watched by a handful of men, women, and children, chiefly women, with wistful faces and anxious eyes. I waited outside for the priest, and walked home with him, engaging him in conversation. He told me proudly that he had been descended from a long line of priests who had lived in the shadow of the great temple for several generations and had officiated at the temple ceremonies for as many decades, if not centuries. The fact of his ancient religious lineage prompted me to put to him three questions which were troubling my own mind.

My first question was: 'Do you love and honour your gods?' 'Why, one might just as well love a tiger! One might just as well honour a triangle! Our gods don't want to be loved or honoured but only to be feared, and propitiated. And these worshippers, whom you saw making their offerings, ordinarily approach the gods only when they are in trouble.'

I did not pursue the argument further but

[1] The writer of this Christmas message, the Rev. D. Chellappa, B.A., is Editor of *The South India Churchman*, the official organ of the Church of South India.

turned to the second question which I had in mind. 'Are you,' I asked, 'oppressed by a sense of sin, by a conflict between good and evil in your heart, by a feeling of impotence to live up to your ideals?' 'Sin?' interrogated the priest, 'now what exactly do you mean by that?' 'By sin,' I said, 'I mean breaking God's will, transgressing His Law.' He smiled. 'You obviously don't know our gods. Who knows what their will is, and when one may unwittingly offend against it? And as for their commandments, there are none, for *they* are above all laws: laws are only for poor hapless mortals. But really, we prefer our deities to leave us alone and to carry on by themselves. In fact, we have little to learn about good and evil from our gods.'

'Just one last question,' I urged, with not much hope of a satisfying answer. 'What do you hope for from this life and after death?' 'Nothing,' came the prompt reply, 'except to live and die as ordained by our fate and to be born again, maybe as a beast, maybe as a Brahmin. It is all predestinated, and there is no escape from this recurrent cycle of births and deaths. But excuse me,' he said hastily, looking back, 'it is night-time and New Moon, and I am old, and I don't like to think of death.' And he left me, turning abruptly.

But I was not even yet awake from my torpor but instead found myself transported in a trice to the bleak, cold, barren, forbidding mountainous heights of Tibet where I saw a tall, spare, fair figure, clad in saffron, bound in ropes, about to be hurled headlong into a deep, bottomless ravine. But something in the look of the captive put cheer into my heart, and I repeated to him my three questions concerning respectively the nature of God, the nature of Man, and the destiny of Man. This time there was no hesitancy, no surprise. To the first question he replied: 'Of course, I do love and honour the One and only God there is. How could I not? Did not the Son of God Himself teach me that God is Love? And did He not Himself prove that by His birth and life, His death and resurrection?' For 'God so loved the world that he gave. . . .' 'Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift.'

I at once proceeded to the next question, about sin, and his answer found an echo in my own heart. But at first a look of agony pervaded his countenance as he cried out: 'O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do!' But presently his face cleared and the words rang out exultantly, as though he were sublimely unaware of his surroundings: 'I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord who giveth us victory over sin and death. . . . Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift.'

The answer to the last question came with equal conviction: 'To me,' he affirmed, 'to live is Christ, to die is gain. . . . Neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus.' And he seemed to shake his fist at a visible foe: 'O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?'

I looked a little more closely at the man, and he seemed strangely familiar. Yes, there was no doubt of it. I had seen him more than thirty years back when I was a schoolboy; he had even come to our home, and prayed for an ailing little sister, and blessed her. Yes, it was none other than Sadhu Sundar Singh! As his persecutors were about to push him over the precipice, I awoke with a start.

What, then, is the difference between the Hindu priest, with his age-long religious traditions, and Sadhu Sundar Singh, the recent convert to Christianity? They dealt with the same questions, but then how differently! Why the difference? Just this—the fact of Christmas. For there are only two classes of people in this world—those who have Christmas, and those who have not; those who are able to say: 'Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift,' and those who are unable to say so; those who belong to the religion of the Divine Incarnation and those who do not. Christmas has answered for us three questions which every thinking human being is bound to ponder.

(1) What is God like, and is there any means of knowing Him and of being united with Him? (2) Is man essentially good, or essentially evil, and if the latter, is any deliverance from sin possible? (3) And is life one long tale of sorrow, one intolerable burden of suffering for most, and is there a more abundant life beyond this life?

The Babe of Bethlehem was born to answer those questions in the intelligible terms of a human life to those who seek, to those who are willing to listen, to those who are ready to accept Him, to those who will allow their lives to be ordered accordingly, and, therefore, to those who are able to acknowledge, in all truth and humble sincerity: 'Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift.'

D. CHELLAPPA.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.